Roma Mendax:

OR THE

FALSHOOD

OF

ROMES

HIGH PRETENCES

TO

INFALLIBILITY and ANTIQUITY

EVICTED.

In confutation of an Anonymous Popish Pamphlet undertaking the defence of *Mr. Dempster* Jesuit.

BY

JOHN MENZEIS Professor of Divinity in *Aberdene*.

Greg. Nissen. lib. 10. cont. Eunom. in append. ad opera Basilii,
Φιλά τῆς λοιδορίας ἐστὶ τὰ ῥήματα τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων
ἀληθείας ὑπροσαπτόμενα

LONDON,
Printed for *Abel Roper*, at the sign of the Sun over against St. *Dunstanes* Church in *Fleet-street*, 1675.

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

IMPRIMATUR.

Guliel. Wigan Reverendiſſimo in Chriſto Pat. D. D Humfr. Epiſc. Lond. a Sacr. Dom.

May 27 1674.

TO THE
RIGHT HONOURABLE

ARTHUR

Earl of Angleſey, Lord Privy Seal, and one of his Majeſtys moſt Honourable Privy Council.

My Lord,

THough learned Pens in moſt countries of Europe, *have travelled ſucceſsfully theſe many years, in diſcovering the impoſtures of* Rome, *ſo as it might ſeem ſufficient to let the world enjoy the tractates already extant on that ſubject; Yet the ſedulity of the miniſters of that Church, in propoſing Sophiſms, often, and long ago confuted, in a new dreſs, as if they were new topicks, yea unheard of demonſtrations, thereby to enſnare unwary Readers, doth impoſe a neceſſity upon ſincere Lovers of Truth, for undeceiving the ſimple, to reſume old Grounds from Scripture, Antiquity, and reaſon formerly improved by our renounced* Heroe's. *This had the ſtronger influence upon me to write theſe curſory animadverſions upon a Popiſh Pamphlet, otherwiſe of ſmall ſignificancy; becauſe ſome through a lazy humour, will not, others being immerſed in worldly entanglements, hardly can peruſe the large volumns of* Chamier, Whittaker, Calvin, Zanchius, Jewel, Uſher, Junius, Chemnitius, Gerard *and other Champions for the Truth;*

yea ſome are ſmitten with ſuch a fancy of Novelty, tha nothing doth reliſh with them, unleſs it come ſmoaking from the Preſs.

I ſhall not deny, but I was likewiſe moved with a juſt indignation, againſt the diſputing party among Romaniſts, many of whom, being byaſſed with intereſt, ſeem to violent their own conſciences in obtruding impoſtures on the World: Can it be ſuppoſed, that men of ſuch raiſed parts, and eminent learning, who cannot but be ſenſible from their own failours, of the weakneſſes attending humane intellects, ſhould believe the infallibility of the Papal chair in Dogmatical deciſions, ſeeing thoſe who often ſit therein are known, neither to be men of greateſt learning and Piety, nor ever did God ſince the foundation of the World, entail infallibility upon an elective ſucceſſion of perſons, chiefly when ſecular intereſts, and intrigues of Polity have the chief ſtroke in the election? Can they believe an univerſal Monarchy over all Princes and Churches to be ſetled by a divine donation on the Biſhop of Rome, ſeeing Scripture hath no veſtige of that fifth Monarchy, unleſs it be in the Apocalyptick predictions, and the Fathers of the ancient Church have not ſpared to contradict the Popes of Rome in their Dogmatical definitions? Can they believe the lawfulneſs of Image-worſhip, (whatever Metaphyſical diſtinctions they have coyned to put a fair gloſs on the matter) it being ſo expreſly prohibited in the decalogue, and no practice thereof occurring in the Chatholick Church, for three Ages and upwards after Chriſt, whereof thoſe great Antiquaries cannot be ignorant? Can theſe great maſters of reaſon, believe the prodigious figment of tranſubſtantiation, which may vye with any of the Fables of Apuleius, Ovid, or Æſop, and is ſo luculently repugnant to the common ſenſe and reaſon of all mankind, that a great man among themſelves, going to Maſs, is reported to have been

ſo

ſo ingenuous, as to ſay, Eamus ad communem errorem? *Can they juſtifie the Lawfulneſs of half Communions, without fighting with their own conſciences, theſe being confeſſedly oppoſite to the primitive inſtitution, and to the known practice, not onely of the Catholick Church, but alſo of the Roman, for many Ages? who would not be moved with indignation, that men ſhould upon deſigne, abuſe their parts and wit to cheat the World? I know not how to reconcile theſe men to themſelves, unleſs it be ſuppoſed, that becauſe they received not the Truth in love, they are given up to ſtrong deluſion, and εἰς ἀποδοκιμον νοῦν. I grant* Bellarmine, Barronius, Perron *and others of that* Cabal *have ſaid much for an ill cauſe. They have indeed ſhewed themſelves to be men of great parts, but of very evil conſciences. They who devote their endowments to the patrociny of hereſie, would remember that errors in religion are ſuch creaſy and burdenſome ſuperſtructures, that the ſtrongeſt ſhoulders muſt needs ſtrink under them*

My bowels in the mean time do yern toward the ſequacious multitude in the Roman Communion, who in the Simplicity of their hearts ſurrender themſelves, to the conduct of ſuch teachers, How grateful is it to theſe who love eaſie methods of Religion among whom are not only thoſe of the meaner ſort of people, but alſo many of greater qualitj) to be freed from ſerious inquiries after divine truths, by an implicite ſubmiſſion to infallible guides? and having once intruſted their faith to thoſe teachers, how ſecure do they judg themſelves, being taught by no meaner Caſuiſt, then Cardinal Tolet, *that its not onely ſafe, but alſo meritorius, to believe the doctrines taught by their teachers, though falſe on the matter, untill they know that the Roman Church teaches otherwiſe. Thus the leaders of theſe deluded people cauſe them to err. Nor will the pretended infallibility of their teachers, be ſufficient apology for them at the great day. This rather will be their condemnation, that upon ſuch a pellu-*

pellucide and improbable pretence they ſhould have made ſmall account of the truely infallible Canon of holy Scripture, which God hath charged thoſe to ſearch who would find eternal Life, Joh. 5.34. *From this ſearch, nothing doth more deterr people, then the thorny and litigious debates, raiſed by School-men and Controverſiſts, as if men behoved turn Scepticks in religion, if they did not implicitly intruſt the conduct of their Faith, to a Romiſh infallible guide. But, bleſſed be our God, its not a matter of ſuch inſuperable difficulty, to find out the truth of Religion, in the holy Scripture, as they who deſign the inſlaving peoples conſciences, do pretend; If prejudices once being laid aſide, men would apply themſelves ſincerely to the uſe of appointed means. For the wiſdome of God hath, with a perſpicuity accommodated to the weakeſt capacities, revealed theſe things which are neceſſary to Salvation: according to that of* Hilary, In abſoluto & facili eſt Æternitas, Non per difficiles queſtiones nos ad vitam Æternam vocat Deus, *and a greater then* Hilary, *the Apoſtle of the Gentiles*, 2 Cor. 4.3. If our goſpel be hid, it is hid to them that are loſt; *and a greater then both, our Saviour Chriſt*, Joh. 7.17. If any do the will of God, he ſhall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God. *One thing I am ſure, its much more eaſie to find out the true religion in Scripture, then by any means whatſoever to attain a rational evidence of Papal or Council infallibility, which yet ought to be preſuppoſed, before an implicite ſubmiſſion to Pope or Council.*

Among the many evils of this generation, nothing ſhould more awake the friends of Truth, zealouſly to appear for her intereſts, then the indifferent neutrality as to this or the other Religion, which ſeemes to be poſſeſſing the minds of many. This I conceive to be a woeful effect, partly of mens irreligious practices, and partly of the Sceptical Queries of Romaniſts concerning the divine

Origi-

Original of the Scriptures; *as if they would rather ſhake men out of all Religion, then that they ſhould not give up themſelves to their implicite ſuperſtition. Theſe and ſuch like accounts induced me to draw theſe lines, yet with a real indifferency whether they ſhould be publiſhed or not; as not doubting but the ſame things had been, and would be treated of by others of greater abilities, and to more advantage.*

Only, It may ſeem ſtrange, how I of another Nation, and living at ſo remote a diſtance, ſhould adventure upon this addreſs to your Lordſhip: I muſt therefore humbly crave leave to give an account of this my preſumption. Theſe Papers having been carried by the hand of a friend into England; *and without either my knowledge or deſign, having the good fortune to arrive at your Lord-ſhips hands; I was told that your Lordſhip was pleaſed not only to caſt a glance of your Noble eye upon them, but alſo, out of your affection to the Truths therein aſſerted, to entertain ſome thoughts of cauſing print them. Upon notice hereof, I reflected on the ſaying of that learn'd and excellent Gentleman, Sir* Charles Wolſely *in his dedication to your Lordſhip of his judicious tract ate of the Reaſonableneſs of Scripture belief,* That the hazard, whereto his Papers were expoſed by your firſt view, would ſufficiently inure them to all future dangers. *Leſt therefore, My Lord, I ſhould incur the hateful ſtain of ingratitude, I cannot but deeply reſent that this ſmall Treatiſe, hath been honoured with ſo Noble, judicious and impartial a Cenſor. The deference alſo I have to your Lordſhips profound judgment, hath animated me not a little, to conſent with more freedome, to the expoſing of it to the verdicts of a Critical World. The Reader cannot expect from me new dogm's; for though the* Virtuoſi *deſerve honour, who enrich the World, with new Phyloſophical inventions; yet new opinions in divinity ſound harſhly, and as* Tertullian,

lian *noted long ago,* Quod primum, verissimum. *Tea hardly can either new argument or new notion be now expected on the Popish controversies, seeing they have been agitated upwards of* 150 *years, by the most learned heads in* Europe. *My whole design was to shew that the old grounds of our Divines did abundantly confute the new gaudy flourishes of Romish emissaries: Wherein, if in any tolerable measure I have answered my undertaking, I hope your Lordship will not be offended to have your name superscribed thereto. So confiding that your Generosity will excuse this boldness of a stranger, I shall not cease to pray that grace, mercy and peace may be multiplyed on your noble family, and that all the Nobility in his Majesties dominions, may account it their honour to be zealous for the reformed Religion (which, however it be mis-represented by Romanists, is the truely Catholick faith) and Exemplary in the practise of Godliness. I say no more, but subscribe my self.*

Aberdene Jun. 17. 1674.

My Lord,

Your Lordships,

Humbly devoted Servant.

J. M.

THE

ROMES

Moſt Specious

CHEATS

Laid Open

The PREFACE.

HAD the Romiſh Miſſionaries, who undertook the defence of Jeſuit *Demſter*, been Maſters of their own paſſions, they would not have covered ſo many pages in the entry of their Pamphlet, with a flood of ſcurrilous revilings, beſides the rivulets of the ſame ſtrain, which run a long through the whole Diſcourſe, Who can expect much ſolidity in the arguings, which are uſhered in by ſuch a deſtempered Prologue? All the influence this hath on me, is to exerciſe my patience a little, and to move my compaſſion the more towards the ſouls, who ſuffer themſelves to be deluded by, and mancipated to theſe fiery zealots, the genuine brood of *Ignatius Loyola*, whoſe name is obſerved by thoſe of his own tribe, to be correſpondent to his genius, *quaſi ab igne natus.*

I have not been Solicitous to enquire after the Author of that anonimous Treatiſe: I am little concerned, whether as ſome ſay, it were *Jeſuit Con*, who would Honour himſelf with the name of *Sinclar*, as the Pope called, *Os Porci*, would be named *Sergius* 2. as *Platina* writes in his life, and *Pol. Virg. de invent. rerum lib.* 4. *cap.* 10. or whether, as others ſuppoſe, it be the whole Cabal of our traficking Miſſionaries, calling in likewiſe forraign ſupplies for their aſſiſtance, I ſay I am lit-

tle concerned in this. For all the Roman Legions cannot conquer one divine truth. Onely some may think strange why they vail their names, seeing they vapour openly in our streets, as if they did contend with the valiantest Gallants of the time. Is it to secure themselves from blushing, when the fallacies of their sophisms is discovered? Or to protect them from recriminations, when they load a known adversary with reproaches? Or as *Bell. in append. ad controv. de Pontif. in Resp. ad lib. anon. Cap.* 2. objected to the Anonimous Author of an invective against the Pope, because he that does evil hates the light? I will use no exorcisms to conjure this Ghost to declare his name, his reviling language discovers he is not descended from the heavenly mansions. If he be come from Purgatory, what affinity there is betwixt the dialect of that Country, and of those who inhabit the lowest regions of hell, they who peruse his book may judge.

Upon sundry accounts I have been the less moved with the *canina eloquentia*, the barking Rhetorick of this Romish Pamphlet. As first because it droped from the Pen of Jesuites, who are sufficiently known to be skilled Architects of lyes and Calumnies. Ask *Alphonsus de Vargas*, *Watson* the secular Priest, and *Montalt*, all Romanists, if it be not so? Do not *Gaspar Hurtado*, *Dicastillus*, and many more Jesuites maintain this as one of their famous Casuistick Doctrines, that he sins not mortally who calumniates another to defend his own honour? Did not *Albius* the Jesuit affirm that he judged it lawful, *licitum existimavi*, to calumniate *Putean* the Capucian, because he apprehended that a writing of *Puteans* did reflect upon the order of Jesuits? Hereupon *Montalt in epist.* 15. peremptorily charges the Fathers of that society *nullus jam tergiversandi locus, Patres, prorsus recusare non potestis quin manifesti calumniatores audiatis, nullum vobis superest perfugium, nisi ut calumniam criminum numero subducatis*, that is, The Fathers of the society were so *manifest calumniators*, that there remained no way of Apologizing for them, but to stretch their wits to defend, that to calumniate is no sin. To whom, I pray, does the Character which *Hierome* gave to *Ruffin*, *Apol.* 3. *contra Ruffinum, maledicere omnibus bonæ conscientiæ signum arbitraris*, better agree then to Jesuites. Yet if any should dare to defame them, his life must pay for it, if their power can reach him, and this also without sin. So mysterious is the divinity of Jesuits and Jesuited persons, *Molina*, *Tanner*, *Laymin*, *Reginald*,

Reginald and *Leſſius*, cited alſo by *Montalt*, *Epiſt.* 7. I am therefore ſo far from being troubled with Jeſuitical invectives, that ſhou'd I hear well from theſe men, I ſhould be apt to ſay, as one in a like caſe, *Quid malefeci.*

Secondly, Becauſe I have noble Fellow-ſufferers, on whom the unſavoury breath of Jeſuits hath blown. Have they not honoured *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, and other eminent Heroes with the like Elogies? How hath this ſcolding Pamphleter puſhed at Holy Mr. *Fox* the induſtrious Compiler of the Book of Martyrs, acute *Chillingworth*, learned *Reynolds*, *Whitaker*, *Featly*, and *Prideaux*? Was not renowned Doctor *Robert Barron* (of whom this Pamphleter ſeems to ſpeak with ſome reſpect, though like a Jeſuit with terms of diminution) while alive, entertained with ſuch civility, as his Brethren, by Jeſuit *Turnbul* in his *Sententia Juris*? is not that modeſt Soul termed by the Jeſuit *cap.* 1. *pag.* 10. *Infamis calumniator*, and *pag.* 8. a man *immodeſti ſpiritus* nay *pag* 5. he ſpares not to charge him with *Caninæ rabies* and *mordendi libido*, *cap.* 2. *p.* 14. with *vanitas*, *mendacium*, *ſtultiloquium*; doth he not entitle his *cap.* 3. *de manifeſtis ejus mendaciis*, *cap.* 4. *de obviis aliquot ejus mendaciis* *cap.* 5. *de obviis aliquot ejus ineptiis*, &c. Though the profound learning of the Doctor be admired by the world, yet the detracting Jeſuit ſets him incomparably below other Proteſtants, *pag.* 6. *Cæteros*, ut Lutherum, Petrum Martyrem *alioſq; Te ſine comparatione doctiores*, *ingenioſiores*, *acutiores*, &c. The reverence I have for the memory of that worthy Perſon (in whoſe chair I have the honor to ſit) ſuffers me not to engliſh theſe ſuperfetations of the Jeſuits choler. So impatient is the Jeſuitical Order of any diſcovery of their impieties; that when the learned *Iſaac Caſaubon* had given an account of the acceſſion of Jeſuit *Garnet*, and his Complices to the Powder Plot, they endeavoured by their lyes and ſlanders, to render not only the famed *Caſaubon* odious to the world, but alſo his Father and whole Family (except his Son *John*, who unhappily turned Romaniſt) nay ſo indiſcreetly zealous were they againſt him, that they declared him no Scholar, a fellow of no judgment, that he could not write Latine, or ſcarce underſtood it, (ſee *Henry Foulis Hiſtory of Romiſh Treaſons*, *lib*, 10. *cap.* 2. *pag.* 699.) which was enough to teſtifie the truth of all the reſt, After that reverend Doctor *Creighton*, in his Preface to *Sylveſter Sguropulus* his Hiſtory of the Council of *Florence*, had given an account of the ſpiteful invectives of *Severinus*, *Binnius*, Cardinal *Barronius*, and

Jesuit *Roderus* against *Photius* the renowned Patriarch of *Constantinople*, he subjoyns, *Heresa, hi Narcissi Jesuitici!* So well known are the Nose-gayes, wherewith Persons of that principle do propine good men. But as it were too little for a Jesuit to spit in the faces of the servants of God, is it not a great part of the work of this Pamphleter, to disgrace the Holy Scriptures as corrupt, both in Originals and Translations? He cannot so much as mention *pag.*7. that word of the Arch Angel *Jude.*9. *increpet te Dominus* without this blasphemous reflection, *that the word* increpet *is changed for* imperet *in our corrupt Bible.* I doubt if an Arch Demon would have charged the Bible as corrupt, because ἐπιτιμαω is rendred by *increpo.* This angry Pamphleter might have learned from Jesuit *Lorinus in loc.* that ἐπιτιμαω signifies *increpo*, or which is much to the same purpose, *additis minis impero*, the like is observed by *a Lapide* in *Mat.*8.26. and by *Maldonat* in *Mat.*8.26. and in *Mat.*17.18. Doth not *Estius* in *Jude v.*9. confess that according to the Greek it ought to be rendered *increpet*, and that some Latine Copies have it so? Yea, he is of opinion, that the Author of the vulgar latine, first rendred it, *increpet tibi Dominus*, and that some afterward, to avoid the solecism of Grammar (for the Author of that Version had no infallible assistance) turned *increpet* to *imperet*, and so indeed *Hierom. Apol.*2. *contra Rufinum*, cites it thus, *increpet tibi Dominus.* What need I more, is not the Hebrew word, *Zach.*3.2. (to which the Arch Angel here alludes) גער, which the Seventy renders ἐπιτιμησαι, and the vulgar *increpet* from the root גער, which *Pagnin in Epit. Thesauri* saies, being construed with ב signifies *increpare*, to rebuke? Do not Jesuites by such practises, confirm the character that *Montalt* gives of them, *nusquam a vestris calumniis intacti sunt boni*, hardly can a good person escape the lash of Jesuites unruly tongues. Now who would not account himself honoured to be a Fellow-sufferer with such Worthies?

But Thirdly, and finally, I am infinitely solaced, when I consider that the real ground of all this obloquy, what ever Adversaries may pretend, is, that unworthy I, have been honoured to bear some testimony against the errours of Popery, and the Pernicious Cabal of Jesuites. Who would regard their spiteful invectives, hearing that beatitude from the mouth of God, *1 Pet.*4.4. *If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the Spirit of Glory resteth on you.* Excellently *Cyprian Epist.*55. *nec movere*

nos

non debent convitia perditorum hominum, quo minus a via recta & a certa regula non recedamus. Hierom wrote to *Auſtine Epiſt.* 8 ; when he had vindicated the truth againſt the Pelagians, *quod ſignum majoris gloriæ eſt, omnes Hereticiteteſtantur*, Its a badge of Honour, ſaid the Father, to be hated by Hereticks ; Why not then by Jeſuites ? I ſhould perhaps have leſs trouble, ſhould I do as *Vibius Criſpus*.

——— *qui nunquam direxit brachia contra.*
Torrentem.

But as that learned Gentlemen, Sir *William Moriee*, on the *Lords Supper, ſect.* 9. p. 146. obſerves, he ſhould have had more Honour and Conſcience had he been

——— *Civis qui libera poſſet*
Verba animi proferre & vitam impendere vero.

It were here eaſie, to repell all the calumnious Criminations thrown upon me by the Cabal of Jeſuites, and to repay them with a volume of too too juſt recriminations, making all their Booffonries rebound on themſelves. Is not the World ringing with the impious Morals of the Jeſuites ? who ever take a latitude to rivile : If, I miſtake not, it were the Jeſuites intereſts to forbear, they having ſo many ſores upon which their Adverſaries may grate, unleſs they think they have no reputation to loſe. But as I was not the Aggreſſour in this debate, ſo neither did I undertake it for any perſonal intereſt, I have therefore judged fit to invert a little of the Jeſuits method, he places his invectives in the front of his Book, as it ſeems, that the Patience of the Reader might be outwearied with that nauſeating ſtuffe, before he came to examine the weakneſs of the argumentative part ; but my deſign being to give a teſtimony to the truth, and to contribute my poor endeavours for eſtabliſhing Souls therein, and if it may pleaſe God to recover thoſe that are gone aſtray. I will firſt canvaſe the Controverſies of Religion, and then take his ſpleeniſh invectives to conſideration, in the mean while I only ſay, *didicit ille maledicere & ego contemnere.*

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

A brief Survey of the Pamphleters empty and unfaithful Apologies for Jeſuit Demſter.

THe title of *Papiſmus Lucifugus*, is of hard concoction with the Pamphleter, yet he is not altogether unhappy in his conjecture concerning it. He ſays, *Pag.* 8. *I gave a ſtrong Thief a ſtrange Name*, I do indeed look on trafficking Jeſuits as pernicious Thieves, they rob men of their deareſt intereſts, of their Religion, and conſequently of their Souls and Salvation. Perhaps this may be one reaſon why Romiſh *Babylon*, *Revel.* 18. 13. Is ſaid to make merchandice of the Souls of men. The conſumptive eſtates of many families in which theſe men do neſt, are a ſhrewd preſumption, they pick purſes as well as conſciences. The Epithet *Lucifugus* had not appeared ſo ſtrange, had he conſidered that *Tertul. lib. de reſur. Carnis cap.* 47. Long ago branded Hereticks as *Lucifugas Scripturarum*, and it may ſeem ſuitable enough to Jeſuit *Dempſters* tergiverſing humour.

The Pamphleter, *pag.* 9. takes the boldneſs, to ſay, *That Jeſuit Dempſter declined not the trial of religion, by Scripture and antiquity.* What will not an effronted Jeſuit affirm? I remit him for his conviction to (one place inſtead of many) Mr. *Dempſters Paper.* 5. *pag.* 60. 61. Why I pray you did he never anſwer to any teſtimony either of Scripture or Antiquity brought againſt him? What means the Rapſody of citations in this Pamphlet, but to make a ſeeming ſupplement of M. *Dempſters* defects? Why contend Romaniſts ſo eagerly for the neceſſity of an infallible viſible judge, but becauſe they dare not adventure to have the controverſies betwixt them and us dicided, either by Scripture or Antiquity? This Pamphleter thinks to ſalve the matter with a knack of Jeſuitical equivocation, *we decline not Scripture and Antiquity*, ſaith he *ibid. as carried by Popes, Biſhops, and Prieſts in communion, with him*; that is, they can be judged by Scripture and Antiquity provided they be taken in no other ſenſe, then the Pope and Court of *Rome* are pleaſed. As if a company of robbers would ſubmit to a jury, but with this Proviſo, that their Ring leader

were

were Chancellour of the Aſſize, and had a negative upon the reſt. Is not this a goodly Apology, that Romaniſts are not *Lucifugi?*

To help all, he adds, *That the Queſtion betwixt Mr.* Dempſter, *and me, was onely of the grounds of the Proteſtant Religion, and not at all of the grounds of Popery.* Grant it had been ſo, yet had he not been a *Lucifugus*, would he not have examined the inſtances of Scripture and Antiquity, which were brought to confirm the Doctrine of Proteſtants? But it would be remembred that Mr. *Dempſter*'s Syllogiſm gave occaſion for an enquiry of a greater Latitude, *viz.* What the reciprocal grounds of the true Religion are, and what the Religion is to which alone theſe grounds do agree; whether Popery, or the Religion of Proteſtants, I pitched on Scripture and Antiquity, as the peculiar grounds of the true Religion, which do exactly quadrate with the Reformed Religion, and not at all with Popiſh ſuperſtition. But Jeſuit *Dempſter* could never be induced either to give a ground of the true Religion, or to confute that aſſigned by me. If this be not a *Lucifugus*, who ever was? Whether I in giving this Title to theſe Papers, or the Pamphleter in quarrelling at it, do *ſtumble at the threſhold*, others may judge. I am not diſpoſed to quarrel at the Title of his Book, *Scolding no Scholarſhip.* I ſuppoſe all will give him this teſtimony (neither do I envy it) that he hath behaved himſelf as an abler Scold than a Scholar.

Albeit Jeſuit *Dempſter*, at the time of our Encounter, was extolled by *Romaniſts* as a *Non-ſuch*, yet his feebleneſs being diſcovered to the world, by the publiſhing of his inſignificant *Papers*. This Pamphleter, *pag.* 9. 10. exerciſes his wit to deviſe ſome lying ſhifts to Apologize both for him and the Popiſh Intereſt, as if 1. *I had been the Aggreſſor and Provoker.* 2. He ſeems to take it ill, *that the verbal conference with Mr.* Dempſter, *is ſaid to have been the fruit of Popiſh Conſultations.* 3. He ſayes, *that Mr.* Dempſter *was a man of conſiſcate health* (a noble Rhetorication forſooth) *fit enough for a civil Conference, but moſt unable for a clamorous Diſpute.* 4. *That he was pitched upon onely as being next at hand.* This bundle of forged lyes diſcovers the Pamphleter (to uſe his own phraſe) to be a perſon of *conſiſcate honeſty*. The true account of that affair I gave in the Dedicatory Epiſtle before *Papiſmus Lucifugus*, which could be atteſted by perſons of unqueſtionable credit. Knows he not, that I can deſign by name the perſons of the Romiſh

miſh Profeſſion (though upon perſonal reſpect I have for them, I do forbear) who did ſolemnly provoke my Reverend Colleague *M.G.M.* and me to that Debate? Is it imaginable, that ſuch a ſolemn Challenge ſhould be given without previous conſultation? Are there ſo few Birds of that Feather about this place, that M. *Dempſter* was onely pitched upon as next at hand? Was he not brought from the Country upon deſign, from a Gentlemans houſe where he did ordinarily reſide? Was there not another ordinary Reſident in the Family where the Debate was? What M. *Dempſter*'s fitneſs was to manage a modeſt debate, may be judged by the peruſal of his Tautologizing Papers, a very anomolous motion in an Arguer, not *a Steering to the ſame point*, as this Pamphleter would excuſe it, *pag.*15. but a toſſing in one place, very near of Kin to that treſpaſs of Arguing, which by Logicians is called *Petitio principii*. Had he been a perſon of ſuch eminent modeſty, and ſo averſe from clamorous diſputes, would he in *Anno* 1658. as I take it, ſo arrogantly *have appealed all the miniſtery of* Scotland *to a Vocal Deſpute, boaſting, that if he did not convince them, he ſhould be hanged up preſently, demanding onely, if they loſt the Cauſe, that they ſhould be hanged up in effigie?* Doth not ſuch a brawling Challenge bewray a petulent humour, and a complacency in clamorous Cavils? But what was the *Aebilles* wherewith this inſolent *Thraſo* thought to have conquered the whole Church of *Scotland*? That goodly Syllogiſm forſooth, in his firſt Paper againſt me, as appears by comparing it with his foreſaid Paper or Defiance: So that this has been a long ſtudied Leſſon, wherein our *Romaniſts* ſeems no leſs to have confided, than once in the *Invincible Spaniſh Armado*, for by it they thought not onely to conquer me, but the whole Church of *Scotland*, and as if it had become an ordinary pocket piſtol among them, the ſame firſt Cartel which M. *Dempſter* ſent to me, was ſent to another Miniſter in this Country, without change of one word: Yet the vain-glorious Jeſuit, when he was put to it, could ſay nothing to confirm any Propoſition of that long-ſtudied Paralogiſm. Doth it not by this appear, that Jeſuits can raiſe Tragical Clamours upon a bable? Nevertheleſs, I muſt do M. *Dempſter* right, if tergiverſing be Modeſty, Learning, Gravity, he had all theſe Endowments, in *Gradu Heroico*. If this be their *Fabius, and old Warriour*, as *pag.*2. he is called, who may not ſee that *Romaniſts* now days live in *ſæculo Romuli*.

Jeſuit

Jeſuit *Demſter* being laid by with this lying Apology, now appears this Pamphleter on the Stage, to ſupply M. *Demſter*'s defects, as if

——— *Si Pergama poſſent*
Defendi dextrâ, dextrâ hac defenſa fuiſſent.

But, if I miſtake not, he has as much need of an Apologiſt as M. *Demſter*: How comes it that he examines not the Objections againſt the five Baſtard Popiſh Sacraments, though that Controverſie was pitched upon by M. *Demſter*'s own choice? How is it, that diſputing the great Queſtion, concerning their infallible viſible Judge, he over-leaps moſt of the Arguments moved by me againſt his Infallibility? How is it, that though he endeavours to prove, that the Popiſh Religion is the Ancient Chriſtian Religion, yet he anſwers nothing to ſeven inſtances I gave in Paper 8. *pag.* 169. *&c.* of the repugnancy of the preſent Popiſh Religion to the Religion of the Ancient Church? How is it, that when this whole debate was occaſioned by a caſuiſtick Queſtion of Repentance, and thereupon I had given a Specimen of the impious Morals of Jeſuits, yet he ſays nothing for the vindication of them? How is it, that he does not at leaſt clear their *Old, Grave, Learned Man*, from that egregious Jeſuitical [illegible]lacy, wherewith I charged him, in the entry of his firſt Paper? Was he ſo afraid to *ſtumble on the Threſhold*, that he reſolved to leap over it? Do not theſe things, beſides many other that might be mentioned, demonſtrate, that this Hyperaſpiſt of Jeſuit *Demſter*'s is ſmitten with the ſame tergiverſing diſeaſe? Is it not likely, that the Popiſh Party, to Apologize for their intereſt, ſhall the next day ſet M. *Con*, or whoever elſe had a hand in this Pamphlet, at as low a rate, as now they do M. *Demſter*. I know not to what more fitly to compare the Pamphleters deſultorious reflections, upon my returns to M. *Demſter*, than to a Flea leaping too and fro.

Qui ceſſim fugit & fugit receſſim,
Et ſubſultibus hinc & hinc citatis,
Vibrat Cruſculs.

Yet theſe, and other his omiſſions, were more eaſily pardonable, had he behaved himſelf with ingenuity in what he has handled;

but this enſuing Treatiſe will diſcover how deceitfully he has miſtated Queſtions betwixt *Romaniſts* and us, how injuriouſly he miſrepreſents Proteſtants; how, in that Congeries of Teſtimonies which he has heaped up, he either miſ-cites them, or alledges them impertinently, or brings them from ſpurious writings, and how, through all, he plays the *Plagiary*, from *Breerly*, *Bell. Gordon* of *Huntly*, *H. T.* his *Manual*, *&c.* and with ſo little diſcretion, that he palpably diſcovers, he has never ſeen the Authors which he cites. He would ſeem to put on the Lyons Skin, but his Ears bewray what an Animal he is. Though all his Cavils have been often confuted by Proteſtants, yet that he diſſembles, as if his Arguments were unanſwerable Demonſtrations, and contained no little of his own invention: Nay, if it might not be looked upon, as the partial Verdict of an Adverſary, I could ſafely ſay, that hardly ſhall a Popiſh Pamphlet of the like quantity be found, wherein there are ſo many filthy prevarications, unbeſeeming both a Chriſtian and a Scholar. This Tractate, I hope, may exhibit a Specimen of the filth of that *Augea's* Stable. One advantage indeed he hath, that the Conſciences of their bigotted Papiſts are ſo debauched with their Implicit Faith, that as *Dionyſius* Flatterers are ſaid to have licked up his phlegm with Exclamations, as if it had been *Nectar* and *Ambroſia*, ſo Jeſuited Papiſts are ready to ſwallow down greedily the moſt excrementitious diſcourſe which drops from a Jeſuit. And to make all to paſs the more ſmoothly, this Pamphleter has plaiſtered over things with Drolleries, and affected Strains of Romantick Rhetorications.

Pag. 32. He upbraids me, *as being at much pains to ſay nothing*; *nullum*, ſays he, *vidi, qui magis operoſè nihil diceret.* I thought he would have excepted Jeſuit *Dempſter*, who ſo often tumbled over one informal Syllogiſm, at leaſt he might have ſpared to reflect on himſelf, as writing a Book to confute nothing.

Eſſe nihil dicisque, nid petis, improbe Cinna.
Si nihil Cinna petis, nil tibi Cinna nego.

Is it not a ſtrange Nothing, whereof ſo many Somethings, and theſe alſo touching the Cauſe, yet remain unanſwered? He muſt be at the pains of another Book, before he diſcuſs all theſe little Nothings. But purpoſely waving at the time his Criminations of this nature, I proceed to note his Reflections, upon the

two

two Arguments which I propounded to M. *Demster* in the Vocal Debate, and upon M. *Demster*'s goodly Syllogism.

To my first Argument drawn from the impious Doctrine of Romish Casuists, that when a man hath sinned hainously, he is not bound to repent presently, The Pamphleter after a false representation of the matter of Fact (whereof I gave a sufficient account in the Epistle Dedicat. before *Papismus Lucifugus*; and of the Atheistical absurdities to which M. *Demster* was brought, by the confirmations of the major of that argument, which the Pamphleter, *pag.* 11. falsly says, *that I did altogether pass in silence.*) I say the Pamphleter answers, *pag.* 12. *That all hold the shortest delay of Repentance both surest and best.* Behold a Jesuitism, that is, a Cheat, to begin with; For this is not the question, whether speedy Repentance be surest, best, and most expedient, but whether repentance be a present duty, and non-repenting a sin? To this he answers nothing directly. How impious must the Doctrine of these Casuists be, when a Jesuit is ashamed directly to own it? Yet if his words be narrowly observed, they bewray him: *The shortest delay*, says he, *is surest and best*; which implies, that to delay repentance may be good and sure, though not the surest and best, *bonum & tutum*, though not *optimum & tutissimum*; and therefore, as if the *Con* were turned to a Fox, he slily insinuates an Argument, to prove the Assertion which he was ashamed openly to avouch, viz. *that a sinner is not bound presently to repent, from the maxim, that affirmative precepts bind semper, sed non pro semper.* To which I answer, that the Maxim includes a solution in its bosom: For though affirmative Precepts bind not for all times, yet they bind for all convenient seasons. Did not the affirmative Precept, of succouring the afflicted, bind the Priest and the Levite, when they passed by the wounded man, betwixt *Jericho* and *Jerusalem*, *Luke* 10. 30, 31, 32. Did they not sin by not succouring him at that time? Yet Romish Casuists deny that a sinner is bound to repent, *quum data occasione commode potest*, when he can do it conveniently, as *Escobar* states the question, *Tom.* 2. *Theol. Moral lib.* 3. *exp.* 8. *Prob.* 28. no not when he seriously calls his sin to remembrance, or when a grievous calamity is upon him, and his Country, or upon Holy and Festival days, as *Vasq;* in *Part.* 3. *Tom.* 4. *q.* 86. *dub.* 6. copiously declares. Yea, it's one of their probable Doctrines, which in practise may safely be followed, that there is

no command at all for repentance. This also being avouched by a Grave Doctor, *Franciscus Victoria*, as testifies *Escobar*, *Cap. Cit. Prob.* 24. But besides, the Pamphleter takes for granted, that the Command enjoyning Repentance is adequately affirmative, which perhaps he may find to be of more difficult probation than he is aware of. When positive duties are required to be done at such seasons, the Command does surely include a negative; the Command enjoyning Circumcision on the eighth day, included a negative, prohibiting delay beyond the day prescribed; when therefore God Commands now to repent, *Act.* 17.30. *To day not to harden your hearts*, *Heb.* 3. 7, 8. Now *to return every one from his evil way*, *Jer.* 18. 11. it includes a negative, prohibiting the delay of repentance.

He has another Cavil to the same purpose; *Ibid. Protestants*, says he, *teach mens best actions to be sinful, and therefore must either confess Repentance at no time to be commanded, or that God hath commanded us to sin.* A foolish and blasphemous inference: For Protestants do not say, that mens actions, as to love God, repent, &c. are sinful, *per se*, or in themselves, but only that, *ex accidenti*, gradual defects cleave unto them, for who can love God so well as they should? Read he never that of *Austin*, Epist. 29. *Plenissima charitas est in nemine, illud autem, quod minus est quam esse debet, ex vitio est, ex quo vitio, non est justus in terra*; that is, perfect love is in no man, and what is less than it ought to be, is stained with sin. Hence it is, that there is no just or sinless man on earth: From this it only follows, that God commands the action, which in it self is good, as love to God, and Repentance, though not the gradual defects which through our infirmity cleaves to them. The contrary Doctrine of Papists and Quakers of a sinless perfection in time, is repugnant to clear Scripture, 1 *Joh.* 1. 8. 10. and is pure *Pelagianism*, as witnesses *Hierom* in his Dialogue betwixt *Atticus* and *Critobelus*, *lib.* 1. and *lib.* 3. *cont. Pelag.* But of this more hereafter, *cap.* 7. Now only he cavils, *that it's a jeering of Gods Commands, to say they are impossible.* To this jeering Cavil, it's answered, that it were absurd indeed, to affirm the Command of God to be simply and absolutely impossible; but not to say, that there is an accidental impossibility to keep the Law perfectly, through the pravity of our natures. So much the Scripture affirms, *Rom.* 3. 8. *Job.* 12. 39. &c. Excellently said *Bernard*, Serm. 50. in Cant. *Deus mandando*

do impoſſibilia, non prævaricatores fecit homines, ſed humiles.

As for his Squibs, *about Repentance, and recantation of Calumnies, and other publick tranſgreſſions againſt Princes*, I know none more concerned therein than Jeſuits. Of their calumniating Genius, ſome touch has been given in the Prologue. Of the treaſonable principles of Jeſuits, *Mariana*, *Suarez*, *Bell. Santarell*, *&c.* an account hereafter may be given. The Author of the Hiſt. of Cardinals, *Part.* 1. *lib.* 1. *pag.* 15. obſerves this to have been always the deſign of Jeſuits, to aggrandize the Pontifical Authority with diminution of the Regal. Have not the impious principles and practiſes of Jeſuits againſt Princes given occaſion to that Character which paſſes on them?

Hi Regnorum proditores
Atque legum fraudatores
Reges volunt jugulare
Et ſic plebem ſubjugare.

My ſecond Argument was taken from the Doctrine of the Council of *Florence*, in *Inſtruct. Armen.* and of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 7. *Can.* 11. ſuſpending the Efficacy of Sacraments from the intention of the Miniſter, from which I concluded, that all certainty of Faith, according to Popiſh principles, was over-turned; for all their Faith depends upon the Authority of Pope, and Councils; but if the Efficacy of Sacraments depend on the intention of the Miniſter, they cannot certainly know who is Pope, or which is a lawful Council, who is Baptized, or who is Ordained, the Efficacy of Baptiſm and Ordination (which alſo with them is a Sacrament) depending on ſecret intentions, whereof they can have no infallible certainty. In this Argument, the Pamphleter ſays, *I both argued and anſwered*, whereas I only argued: But indeed Jeſuit *Demſter* could neither argue nor anſwer. Of the replies given to this Argument by this Scribler, *pag.* 12, 13, to ſupply M. *Demſter*'s defects, I may ſay

Sunt tricæ Apinæ, & ſi quid levius iſtis.

As *firſt*, he ſays, *There is greater aſſurance of the Prieſts intention, than that Miniſters uſe aright the Elements, and pronounce the words of Inſtitution.* As if we could have more aſſurance of

ſecret

secret thoughts of a mans heart, than of words audibly pronounced, or of visible actions performed before a whole Congregation.

Secondly, *God*, saith he, *hath promised that nothing necessary either to Faith or Salvation, shall be wanting in his Church.* What then? doth it therefore follow, that our Faith must be built upon secret intentions, whereof we can have no infallible assurance? or doth he mean, that a Priest can never waver in his intentions in ministring Sacraments? Sure I am, he has neither Scripture, nor Canon of Council, nor suffrage of Antiquity to warrant such a fancy. Nay, the Canons, which suspend the Efficacy of Sacraments upon the intention of the Priest, suppose the Priest may have undue intentions, or perhaps he meant (for I am here left to Divine at the Pamphleters intentions) that no person uncapable of the Papacy can be chosen Pope. So indeed Jesuit *Valentia* saith, *Tom. 3. Disp. 1. q. 1. Punct. 7. Sect. 9. Col.* 223. But this may be convicted of manifest falshood from History. Did not *Bennet* the Ninth, according to *Onuphrius*, in *Chron. Pontif.* sit on the same Throne 22 years, whom yet *Glaber* in *Spondan. ad Annum* 1033. asserts to have attained it Symoniacally, being about ten years of age? But I satisfie my self at the time with the ruthful complaint of *Platina* in the Life of *Sylvester* the Third, that such was become the state of the Papacy, that he carried the Chair who gave most for it. Certainly therefore these Romish Doctors, who by the forecited *Valentia*'s acknowledgment, confess the Papal See not to have immunity from illegitimate Popes, are the more ingenuous.

The Pamphleter *replies. Thirdly, That the want of the Ministers intention may be supplied by the intention, desires, and love of the receiver.* But 1. I know not what to make of this, if it be not a yielding of the Cause, and a manifest contradiction to the Doctrine of their Church. For if the intention of the receiver can supply that want, then it's falsly defined by the Council of *Trent* and *Florence*, that the Efficacy of Sacraments depend upon the intention of the Minister; it should rather depend upon the intention of the receiver. 2. A man cannot be sure of his own Graces, according to Romanists; consequently the Efficacy of Sacraments, and so of all their Religion, must yet depend upon an uncertain condition: Yea, *Bell. lib. 3. de Justificatione, cap. 8.* concludes, that a man cannot be sure that his sins are forgiven him,

him, becauſe he cannot be ſure of the intention of the Prieſt in giving Abſolution, were the matter ſufficiently ſupplied by the receivers intention, deſires, and love to God, how inconſequent were *Bellarmine*'s argument. Whither, I pray, did *Bell.* or this Pamphleter underſtand Popiſh principles beſt? But 3. Suppoſe one adult perſon, receiving Baptiſm or Orders, had aſſurance of his own Graces, and of his own intentions and deſires, yet others could not: Conſequently, others could not certainly know, that he were either Baptized or Ordained. But 4. Though the defect of the Prieſts intention could be thus ſupplyed in adult perſons, yet there were no remedy for Infants, who are not capable of ſuch intentions; and therefore the Pamphleter himſelf reſtricts this evaſion *to thoſe that are come to Age*; and ſo there could be no certainty whether Pope *Pius* the Fourth, who confirmed the Council of *Trent*, or the preſent *Clement* the Tenth (whom I ſuppoſe to have been baptized in their Infancy) were really baptized; and conſequently, whether ever they were in a capacity to be Popes.

Fourthly, ſaith the Pamphleter, *The conferring of a Sacrament is not only* actio hominis, *but* humana, *that is a deliberate action. Quid hoc ad Rhombum?* The Queſtion betwixt us and Papiſts, is not, whether it be neceſſary that the Miniſter have a deliberate intention to go about the outward Sacramental action; that we freely grant, and that is ſufficiently known by the grave outward performance of the work, becauſe *Ambroſius Catharinus* required no more as ſimply neceſſary to the being of the Sacrament. *Bell. lib.* 1. *de S. c. in Genere. cap.* 27. profeſſed, he did not ſee wherein *Catharinus* Opinion differed from the Doctrine of Hereticks (ſo he deſigned Proteſtants) condemned by the Coun il of *Trent*; therefore generally the Popiſh Doctors, as *Bell. Suarez*, *Conink*, *Lugo*, *&c.* require further, as neceſſary to the being of a Sacrament, that the Miniſter have an intention by theſe outward actions to conſtitute a Sacrament. Now ſure it is, that without a ſpecial Revelation, none can have infallible certainty, that another has ſuch an intention, and this is a further intention than is requiſite, *ut actio ſit humana.*

But *fifthly*, ſaith the Pamphleter (for I ſee *Con* muſt have many holes to retire to) *What if a Mad man be in a frolick, or a Comedian in a jeer ſhould pour out Water on any one, and pronounce the words, were it a Sacrament? Anſw.* No verily. This brings

brings to my mind how Cardinal *de Lugo Tract. de Sacram. Disp.* 8. *Sect.* 2. *Num.* 14. grosly misrepresents Protestants in this matter; for this he gives as the difference betwixt *Catharinus* (though him also he disallows) and us, as if *Catharinus* did require that the Minister did behave himself as if he dealt seriously, but that Protestants maintained it to be enough, if the outward Sacramental actions were performed, though the Minister openly declared that all were done in derision. O the affronted impudency of Jesuits! We abominate such impious thoughts; never was any such thing taught by the Reformed Churches. See *Vossius de Bapt. Disp.* 10. *Thes.* 11. 12, 13. yea *Bell. lib.* 1. *de Sac. in Gen. cap.* 27. acknowledges the contrary to be taught by *Chemnitius*, in *Exam. Concil. Trid. Can.* 11. *Sess.* 7. Yet Jesuits who have made lyes their refuge, dare so fouly misrepresent us. Nay, on the contrary, we say a Minister sins hainously, if he carry not both seriously and devoutly in going about these holy things. See *Chamier lib.* 1. *de Sacram. in Gen. Cap.* 19. *Sect.* 21. only we affirm, if a Minister should behave himself seriously as to all outward appearance, whatever impious intention he may harbour secretly in his own breast, that cannot prejudge the devout receiver of the Sacrament, and so the Catholick Church did ever teach. Hence *Austin*, *lib.* 3. *de Bapt. Cont. Donat. cap.* 15. *Si Evangelicis verbis in nomine Patris, filii & S. Sancti, Marcion Baptismum consecravit, integrum erat Sacramentum, quamvis ejus fides, sub eisdem verbis aliud opinantis quam Catholica veritas docet, non esset integra sed fabulosis vanitatibus inquinata.* Thus Romanists suspending the Efficacy of Sacraments upon the secret intention of the Priest, differ not from us only, but also from the Ancient Catholick Church; they overturn all certainty of Faith, and throw themselves upon perpetual hazard of Idolatry: They cannot know, even according to their own principle, whether what they adore in the Mass be Christ, or only a morsel of bread; neither are these meer Niceties. Doth not famous Authors record, how both Jews and Heathens in *Spain* and *Italy* have counterfeited Christianity for base ends, and have assumed Orders, and gone about the external Sacramental Rites but with sacrilegious intentions? Whose heart would not bleed to see the Mazes and Labyrinths in which Romanists do involve themselves, and the irreconcileable debates they have among themselves as to this thing, insomuch that Jesuit

ſuit *Carleton Tom. 2. Theol. Scholaſt. Diſp. 63. Sect. 3. Num. 1.* ſaith, *Mirum quot quamque varii ſunt in hac parte inter Scholaſticos dicendi modi.* I will not blot paper with them. I hope by this time it appears the Pamphleters quiblings have not looſed the Knot more than M. *Demſter's* ſilence.

After many abortive attempts of M. *Demſter* to reduce his Syllogiſm to ſome tolerable ſhape, this Pamphleter, *pag.* 28, 29. makes an Eſſay more. Though all the Propoſitions thereof be as negatively expreſſed, as Negatives uſe to be in the Engliſh Language, yet to vindicate his Fellow-Jeſuit from ſuch informality of arguing, he alledges *the ſecond Propoſition to be an Affirmative*; and to add ſome colour thereto, he puts this Latin Gloſs upon it (for it ſeems he could not ſalve the buſineſs in Engliſh) *Sed Religio Proteſtantium eſt habens nullum peculiare fundamentum.* Had Jeſuits ſo much ingenuity as to acknowledge an over-reaching, I had ſhewed them from the beginning how to have rectified the form of their Syllogiſm, without running to violent or infinitant Gloſſes: But that Logical treſpaſs in the ſtructure of Jeſuit *Dempſter's* Syllogiſm was my leaſt Exception againſt it. The main thing I ever demanded was a probation of that minor, whether it be formally, or only objectively negative, and a Solution of the retorſion of that ſame Syllogiſm againſt the Popiſh Religion, but neither of theſe could ever M. *Demſter* be induced to undertake. Had this Pamphleter ſupplied M. *Demſter's* defects in theſe, he had done Mr *Demſter* a better office, and given more ſatisfaction to his Reader. Yet ſeeing they will be making a buſineſs about the form of that Syllogiſm, the Pamphleter would conſider how he reconciles himſelf with M. *Demſter*, who in *Paper 6. pag.* 7. ſays, *all the three Propoſitions of his Syllogiſm are affirmatives*; but this Pamphleter *only ſays that the ſecond is affirmative*; which of theſe ſhall I believe? May not a *Bajon* put ſuch infinitant Gloſſes upon the reſt of the Propoſitions, as the Pamphleter hath put on the ſecond? Conſequently not the Minor only, but the Concluſion alſo ſhould be affirmative, *viz. Ergo*, the Proteſtant Religion cannot be the true Religion, which whether it be an affirmative or negative, I remit to the deciſion of the diſintereſted. It ſeems the Pamphleter muſt take a Journey down to the Infernal Regions (if the Author of *Ignatius* Conclave be not miſtaken concerning the receptacle of Jeſuits) to conſult with

M. *Demſter*, whether only the ſecond Propoſition, or all were affirmatives; yet I have the kindneſs to premoniſh him that

> *Facilis deſcenſus averni*
> *Sed revocare gradum, ſuperaſque evadere ad auras*
> *Hoc opus hic labor eſt*

Pag. 29, 30, 31. The Pamphleter endeavours to caſt a blind before the eyes of his Reader, by a groſs repreſentation of the ſtate of the debate betwixt M. *Demſter* and me. To clear the truth herein, it would be remembred, that M. *Demſter Paper* 1. *pag.* 2. aſſerted *the Proteſtant Religion had no grounds to prove it ſelf a true Religion.* To which it was anſwered in my *Pap.* 1 *pag.* 7. that it were as eaſie by way of retorſion to aſſert, that the Popiſh Religion had no grounds to prove it ſelf to be the true Religion; and therefore if he intended to ſatisfie Conſciences, he ought to pitch upon the reciprocal grounds of the true Religion, and to demonſtrate that theſe did agree to the Popiſh Religion, and not to ours. This Jeſuit *Demſter* altogether declined, only at length, *Pap.* 4. *pag.* 38. *he undertook, if I would produce the grounds of our Religion, that he ſhould impugn them.* Hereupon, in my *Paper* 4. I did produce two grounds, ſufficiently diſtinctive of the true and falſe Religion, *viz.* the perſpicuity of the Scripture in all things neceſſary to Salvation, and conformity in all Fundamentals with the Ancient Chriſtian Church; and from theſe, in that *Pap.* 4. I did demonſtrate both the truth of our Religion, and the falſhood of the Romiſh Religion. But the ſcope of all M. *Demſter's* Papers thereafter, was to ſhun the Tryal of Religion by Scripture or Antiquity, yet could bring no reaſon why theſe aſſigned grounds ſhould not be admitted as diſtinctive Teſts of the true and falſe Religion. Nor did he once attempt to anſwer the Arguments, by which, from theſe grounds, I proved the truth of the Reformed, and falſhood of the Popiſh Religion. I appeal to the Papers themſelves, whereof the *ipſa corpora* are exhibited in *Papiſmus Luciſugus*, if this be not the true ſtate of the debate.

By this the unfaithful dealing of this Pamphleter may appear, who *pag.* 31. *is bold to ſay, that ſtill I declined to bring any poſitive proof, that theſe grounds were peculiar to Proteſtants, and that,*

M. Dem-

M. Demſter was not bound to prove the contrary. Did I not *Paper* 4. *pag.* 46, 47, 53, 54, 55. prove from theſe grounds, both the truth of the Proteſtant Religion, and falſhood of the Romiſh? Did I not more particularly give a Specimen of the peculiar intereſt of Proteſtants in theſe grounds, *Pap.* 7. *pag.* 126, 127. by demonſtrating the conformity of our Doctrine with that Scripture, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, and of the diſſonancy of the Romiſh Tranſubſtantiation; and *Pap.* 8. *pag.* 169. &c. gave ſeven inſtances of the conformity of our Religion with Antiquity, and the diſagreement of theirs? Did I not offer to do the like in other points of difference betwixt us, would Jeſuit *Demſter* examine theſe? But their *old Fabius* durſt never come to an open Field; for M. *Demſter's Obligation* to impugne theſe grounds aſſigned by me: I need ſay no more, but that *Paper* 4. *pag.* 38. he undertook to do it, *and acknowledged it was incumbent to him as the Opponent*, unleſs it be ſaid, that Jeſuits are ſo nimble, that promiſes do not bind them. Is it not a Noble ſimile whereby the Pamphleter would put a face upon ſo foul a buſineſs, *pag.* 15. Tautologizing M. *Demſter, as the Creditor frequently demands payment of his debt, and I, as Debtor, am ſaid to anſwer his demands only with ſtories of late Wars, and Forreign Leagues.* I pray by what Law do reiterated demands of payment by a pretended Creditor, make another to be his Debtor? Whom would not affronted Jeſuits make their Debtors, if by the importunity of their demands they could impoſe Obligations upon others? Are Romaniſts no more convinced, when their Tranſubſtantiation, half Communions, Adoration of Images, the Popes Infallibility, Supremacy over the Catholick Church, and Secular Princes, Purgatory, Apocryphal Scriptures are confuted (for theſe, and ſuch like, were the points my Replies did run upon) then in Exotick ſtories? May not this Simile with more reaſon be inverted thus: When Jeſuit *Demſter* alledged I was his Debtor, I not only told the Allegation was falſe, and therefore required him, as he would not be held a Caviller, to prove the Debt, by Bond or otherwiſe, which he could never do, but alſo I charged him as being my Debtor, for which I produced ſuch Evidence as he could not controul, only as if Jeſuits had an Art of paying their Debt by bold Aſſertions, he had the confidence oft to ſay, I was owing him, and this procedure is juſtified by the Pamphleter. Now whether M. *Demſter* as Debtor, or the Pamphleter as Procutor, have diſcovered leaſt ſincerity, others may judge.

It is further to be noted, that the Pamphleter in that *pag.* 34. *maintains, that without an Infallible Judge of Controverſies, we cannot be aſſured either of the incorrupt writings, or ſincere Doctrine of Fathers, or of the incorrupt Letter, or genuine ſenſe of Scripture*; by which, with one daſh, he hath deſtroyed the whole Plagiary heap of Teſtimonies from Scripture and Antiquity, which are raked together in his Pamphlet, to which there can be no Faith given without the ſentence of his Infallible viſible Judge, that is of the Pope, for I know none elſe they have at preſent pretending to Infallibility, there being no General Council at the time. And *Greg. de Valentia lib.* 8. *de Annal. fid. cap.* 7. puts the matter out of doubt. *Eadem* (ſaith he) *eſt Authoritas Infallibilis quæ Pontifici Romano & quæ Eccleſiæ ſive Conciliis tribuitur, nam illa ipſa Authoritas quæ in uno Pontifice reſidet, Authoritas dicitur Eccleſiæ & Conciliorum*; that is, it is the ſame Infallible Authority which is aſcribed to the Pope, and to the Church or Councils; for the ſame Authority which reſides in the Pope alone, is ſaid to be the Authority of the Church, and of Councils. So that hither the ſtate of the Controverſie betwixt us and Romaniſts is reduced, whether the Popiſh Religion is to be believed to be the only true Religion, becauſe their Infallible Judge, that is the Pope ſays ſo? Is not this a goodly caſe to which Jeſuits would reduce Chriſtianity, to make all Religion hang at the ſleeve of an Uſurping Pope? Is not the Popiſh Cauſe deſperate, when they have no way to prove themſelves to be in the right, or us in the wrong, but becauſe their Pope, a Party and Head of their Faction ſays ſo? The Hinge then of all Controverſies betwixt Romaniſts and us, at leaſt as managed by the Jeſuited Party, returns hither, whether by the Verdict of the Pope, as infallible viſible Judge, or by the holy Scriptures, and conformity with the Faith of the Ancient Church, we are to judge of the truth of Religion? Proteſtants hold the latter, our Romiſh Miſſionaries the former; let Chriſtians through the world conſider, whether what they or we ſay be more rational.

I am challenged, *pag.* 24. *as not having candour*, for ſaying, *that Quakeriſm is but Popery diſguized.* But there is leſs candour in the Accuſer; for I only ſaid, if it were otherwiſe, Learned and Judicious men were miſtaken. His frivolous Apologies are like to confirm theſe men in their Opinion, for many of the Quakers Notions are undoubtedly Popiſh Doctrines; ſuch as, that the Scriptures are not the principal and compleat Rule of Faith, that a ſinleſs perfection

fection is attainable in time, that men are justified by a righteousness wrought within them, that good works are meritorious, that Apocryphal Books are of equal dignity with other Scriptures, that the efficacy of Grace depends on mans free will, that real Saints may totally Apostatize, that in-dwelling concupiscence is not our sin, until we consent to the lusts thereof, *&c.* If *Quakerism were Puritanism in puris naturalibus*, as this Scribler doth rant, how comes it that Quakers have so much indignation at these who go under the name of Puritans, and so much correspondence with Romanists, with whom before they could not converse? Do not Non-Conformists abhor these fore-mentioned Quaker Tenets? The differences at which he hints, betwixt professed Papists and Quakers, do at most prove that Quakerism is disguized Popery: if there were no seeming difference, there would be no disguize in the business. Cannot Romanists, chiefly Jesuits, transform themselves into all shapes for their own ends? Have not persons gone under the character of Quakers in *Britain*, who have been known to be professed Priests, Monks, or Jesuits in *France* and *Italy*? My self did hear a chief Quaker confess before famous Witnesses, *that one giving himself out for a Quaker in* Kinnebers *Family near* Montrose, *was discovered to be a Popish Priest*; and some Romanists, in this place, have confessed the same to me. Yet the differences assigned by the Pamphleter betwixt Papists and Quakers, signifie not very much when they are narrowly examined, And first, as to Women Preachers, do not Papists hold *Hildegardys*, *Katherine* of *Sens*, and *Brigit*, *&c.* for Prophetesses? Not to mention their Papess *Joan*, or how they allow Women to Baptize, as is defined in *Concil. Florent. Instruct. Armen.* As for their *private Spirit*, I pray, what other grounds hath the Romish infallible Judge to walk upon, but Enthusiasms and pretended inspirations? For Fathers and Scriptures (according to them) have not Authority antecedently to his Sentence. As *for Reformation by private persons*, the whole work of Quakers is to break the Reformed Churches, which is a real deformation, and a promoting of the Popish Interest; and if there be secret Warrants from the Pope for that end, for which there want not presumptions, they have as great Authority as trafficking Popish Missionaries. Quakers do not say, as he alledges, *that they build on the naked Word*, if by the Word he mean the Scripture; nay, in this, as in many other things, they Romanize, *by denying the Scripture to be the compleat and principal Rule of Faith*. I am jealous both Papists and

and Quakers could wiſh there were not Scripture in the World. Though Quakers ſeem *to make light of Fathers and Councils*, yet they maintain theſe Tenets, which Papiſts ſay are Authorized by Fathers and Councils: At leaſt a knack of Jeſuitical equivocation will ſalve all. By this time it may appear, all he hath ſaid, doth not prove that Quakers are not carrying on a Popiſh deſign. But of theſe things enough; I now proceed to the more important Controverſies.

CHAP. II.

There is no neceſſity of an Infallible viſible Judge of Controverſies in the Church, and conſequently the Baſis of the Pamphleters whole Diſcourſe is overthrown.

IT is hard to ſay, whether in handling this Queſtion, the Pamphleter in his *Sect.* 3. bewray more diſingenuity or ignorance: For *pag.* 33, 34, 35, 36, 37. more like a Hiſtrionical declaimer, than a Diſputant; He breaths out a moſt calumnious invective againſt the Reformed Churches, as if *they robbed the Catholick Church of all Judiciary Authority, and ſet up a Law without a Judge*: Becauſe, forſooth, they cannot ſubſcribe to this erroneous Aſſertion, *of the neceſſity of an Infallible viſible Judge*, whereby the Jeſuited Party endeavour to juſtifie the Tyrannical Uſurpation of the Pope of *Rome*. Neither is this Aſſertion, for which he pleads, as the Doctrine of the whole Romiſh Church, approved by all Romaniſts: Nor do they, who ſeem to approve of it, agree among themſelves, who is that pretended Infallible Judge. Moreover, inſtead of bringing Arguments to confirm his Aſſertion, from *pag.* 37. to 43. he rifles out of late Pamphlets a *Farrago* of Teſtimonies to prove, *that the Church cannot erre*, which, as may anone alſo appear, is a different concluſion from that now under debate: And though none of theſe Teſtimonies, when rightly underſtood, do militate againſt the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, as Proteſtants have often demonſtrated, yet he does not examine what Proteſtants have replied concerning them. Laſtly, Whereas he ſhould have anſwered the Arguments propounded in the debate with M. *Demſter*, againſt the neceſſity of this Infallible viſible Judge, he frames to himſelf,

pag.

pag. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47. ſome other Objections, which he endeavours to canvaſs: So that, I may ſay, he combats throughout that *Sect.* 3. with a man of Straw of his own making; and this is that imaginary Triumph, in which our Romiſh Millionaries, and their implicit Proſelites, have ſo vainly gloried.

For ſatisfaction therefore of the ingenuous lovers of Truth, I ſhall firſt premiſe ſome things, for unfolding the true ſtate of the Queſtion. 2. Diſprove by ſome Arguments (I hope convincing) the neceſſity of this Infallible viſible Judge. 3. Examine the Cavils and Objections of the Adverſary.

SECT. I.

The true ſtate of the Queſtion propounded.

FOr opening the true ſtate of the Controverſie, it is firſt to be noted, that this Queſtion is not entirely the ſame with that, *Whether the Church can erre*, for there be great Doctors in the Roman Church, who hold the Church cannot erre, and yet deny the neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge. There are who make the ſubject of Infallibility to be the defenſive multitude of Believers, and not the Collective of Paſtors, far leſs any Repreſentative cloathed with a Judiciary Authority, and leaſt of all the Pope (whom ſome abuſively call the Church Virtual) as ſhall appear in Argument 2. Conſequently, whatever teſtimonies do only prove that the Collective Body, either of Believers or Paſtors (neither of which do aſſemble in Councils Judicially to determine Controverſies of Religion) cannot erre, are impertinently alledged.

It would ſecondly be obſerved, that *Infallibility* and *Judiciary Authority* are things different, and ſeparable Princes have Judiciary Authority over their Subjects, and Provincial Synods within their reſpective bounds, yet neither do pretend to Infallibility. Is it not too groſs ignorance in a Jeſuit, to take a Judge, and an Infallible Judge, for terms reciprocal.

Thirdly, It is one thing to aſſert that perſons or Judges have an aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, guiding them infallibly, *hic & nunc*, into the way of truth, and a quite other thing to ſay, *that there is a Judge to whom a perpetual and infallible aſſiſtance is entailed, ſo as the knowledge of his infallible aſſiſtance is a neceſſary prerequiſite before an aſſent of Faith can be given to any Divine Truth.* The firſt

Prote-

Proteſtants grant to Councils, whether greater or leſſer, defining Divine Truths: The latter is that which M. *Demſter* aſſerted often, and this his *Fidus Achates* ought to have proved. His Arguments therefore not inferring this concluſion, they all treſpaſs *ab ignoratione elenchi*.

Fourthly, It is granted on all hands, that particular Churches, and their Repreſentatives may erre. Now the Roman Church is but one particular Patriarchate, and in her greateſt Latitude, of which the Pamphleter talks, *pag.* 46. *as comprehending all theſe who live in communion with the Biſhop of* Rome, *acknowledging his Headſhip and Supremacy*; She is but a part, yea and the leſſer part of Chriſtendom. Whatever Infallibility therefore may be claimed by the Catholick Church, yet the Roman Church in whatſoever capacity, whether defenſive or repreſentative, can have no juſt Title thereunto. Was there any Roman Church known in the Apoſtles days, but that to which the Apoſtle *Paul* wrote? But he writes to Her as one ſubject to Errour, yea, and to total Apoſtacy, *Rom.* 11. 20, 21. *Be not high minded, but fear; for if God ſpared not the natural branches, take heed leſt he alſo ſpare not thee. Behold therefore the goodneſs and ſeverity of God, on them which fell, ſeverity, but towards thee, goodneſs, if thou continue in his goodneſs, otherwiſe thou alſo ſhalt be cut off.* Would the Apoſtle have written at this rate to the Infallible Chair?

Fifthly, Proteſtants freely grant, that the truly Catholick Church hath immunity from Errours oppoſite to Fundamental Articles, or to theſe Truths, the misbelief whereof is abſolutely, and in all caſes, inconſiſtent with Salvation, were it otherwiſe, the Catholick Church ſhould totally periſh from the earth; which cannot be; as Proteſtants firmly believe, according to the Scriptures. But Romaniſts not ſatisfied with this, plead for an abſolute Infallibility to their pretended Catholick Judge, or *an immunity from all Doctrinal Errours in Religion, greater and leſſer.* Whatſoever Arguments therefore prove not an abſolute immunity of this Judge from the leaſt Doctrinal Errour, fall ſhort of the mark. Of this diſtinction of Truths Fundamental and Non Fundamental, and conſequently of the Errours oppoſite to theſe Truths, that there is not ſuch abſolute neceſſity, in order to Salvation, of immunity from the one, as from the other, there will be occaſion to ſpeak at more length, *Cap.* 4.

Sixthly, Therefore to wrap up all. In the Romaniſts Aſſertion *of the*

the neceſſity of an Infallible viſible Judge, theſe five things are included. 1. That this ſuppoſed Judge hath an Univerſal Supremacy, or a Juridical Authority over the whole Catholick Church, to bind the Conſciences of all Chriſtians with his Sentences, elſe he would not ſerve the neceſſity of the whole Catholick Church. 2. That the priviledge wherewith this Catholick Judge is cloathed, is abſolute Infallibility, or immunity from all Errour, greater or leſſer, in all his Doctrinal deciſions. 3. That the knowledge of the Infallibility of this Judge, is neceſſarily pre-required to every aſſent of Divine Faith. For this cauſe do they contend ſo hard for this priviledge, that all Chriſtian Faith may hang at the Girdle of their Infallible Judge. 4. That this Judge is viſible, that is, a preſent Member of the viſible Church actually exiſting upon Earth. There is no queſtion but the Lord Chriſt is Infallible Judge of all Controverſies of Religion, and that he is viſible in his Humane Nature, but he is not now viſible upon Earth, as a preſent Member of the Church Militant; therefore it is another Judge, actually exiſting upon Earth, for which they plead. 5. That there is a neceſſity of the exiſtence of this infallible viſible Judge upon earth. It is beyond doubt, that there was an infallible viſible Judge in the Church Militant, when Chriſt and his Apoſtles did converſe on earth. Now the Jeſuited party affirms it muſt be always ſo.

From all theſe the ſtate of the Queſtion emerges clearly, *viz.* Whether in the Militant viſible Church there be always a neceſſity of a perſon or perſons endued with a Juridical Authority over the whole Catholick Church, and with infallible aſſiſtance, for deciding all Doctrinal Controverſies of Religion, of whoſe Catholick Juriſdiction and Infallibility every one muſt be perſwaded, before he can give an aſſent of Faith to any Divine Truth; Jeſuited Romaniſts maintain the affirmative, we the negative: Where it's to be noted, that their affirmative being a copulative, conſiſting of many branches, if any one of them fail, their whole Cauſe is gone. The proof of this affirmative, in all its branches, was that which the Adverſary ſhould have hammered out, had he really intended to ſatisfie Conſciences: But any intelligent Reader, upon a ſlender review of his *Sect.* 3. will ſee that this he never once endeavours, but only with ſome frothy flouriſhes to abuſe unwary Souls.

SECT. II.

Arguments proving that there is no neceſſity of an Infallible viſible Judge in the Church.

I Might perhaps ſufficiently acquit my ſelf againſt my Adverſary, by diſcovering the emptineſs of his Objections: yet the ſuppoſed *neceſſity of this infallible viſible Judge*, being the Baſis of his whole diſcourſe, and our Jeſuited Romaniſts laying the whole ſtreſs of their Religion on this Hypotheſis, I judged fit, for the ſatisfaction of thoſe who are not in love with Errour, by a few convincing Arguments, to overthrow this Pillar of the Romiſh Faith; *viz.* the pretended neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge.

Nam collapſa ruunt ſub ductis tecta columnis.

Arg. 1. There can be no ground brought to prove this pretended Infallibility, as in the ſtate of the Queſtion it hath been deſcribed; *Ergo*, it ought not to be believed. The ſequel is evident, eſpecially ſeeing I hope it will not be pretended that the Aſſertion of the Adverſary is, *propoſitio per ſe nota*, or carries with it an intrinſick Evidence. Nay, Faith being an aſſent founded upon Divine Authority, where no Divine Authority is interpoſed, there can be no aſſent of Faith. The antecedent ſhall be proved *ſolutione objectionum.* Is not the teſtimony of an infallible viſible Judge the ground of all Divine Faith, according to this Pamphleter: If therefore he would have us give an aſſent of Faith to this Article of the neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge, ought he not to have confirmed it by the teſtimony of an infallible viſible Judge? But no ſuch teſtimony doth he alledge in all his *Sect.* 3. where he undertakes to diſpute this Controverſie, but only ſome miſapplied ſhreds of Scripture and Fathers, none of which does he hold as teſtimonies of an infallible viſible Judge: The infallible viſible Judge being a living member of the preſent viſible and Militant Church, would it not then appear, that either this is no Article of Faith for which he contends, or that Articles of Faith are not neceſſarily to be proved by the teſtimony of an infallible viſible Judge.

Though this Argument need no further confirmation, till I come to canvaſe his objections, yet, for his conviction, I will uſe this Induction. If the neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge can be proved, then either by Scripture, or by Reaſon, or by Fathers, or by Tradition,

Tradition, or by Miracle, or by Enthusiasm, or we must believe this Infallibility of their visible Judge upon his own word, but by none of these can it be proved, *ergo* not at all. If my enumeration be defective, let him, or any for him, supply it; for confirming the Assumption, I shortly run through the particulars. 1. Not by Scripture; for, according to him, I can neither know the Divine Original, nor sense of Scripture, but by the testimony of this infallible visible Judge: Doth he not then discover that he knows not what he does, when he alledges Scripture to prove that there is an infallible visible Judge? is not this to prove *ignotum per ignotius*? Nor 2. By *Reason*; this pretended Infallibility being only from supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost; and seeing the necessity of the Church may be provided for by an infallible Rule, as shall appear *Cap.* 5. Natural Reason can neither be expected, nor is it alledged by him to prove it. Nor 3. By *Fathers*, ought not the infallibility of the Fathers to be first proved, before the necessity of this infallible visible Judg be believed for their testimony? And how shall this be done, seeing Fathers confess themselves to be fallible, as shall appear Argument 8. Are there not many spurious writings passing under the names of Fathers? Are not the writings of Fathers often ambiguous, dark, and obnoxious to various constructions? Are there not in them not only seeming, but real contradictions? Is it not beyond controversie, that in many places the writings of Fathers are vitiated and adulterated? If then there be need of the testimony of an infallible Judge to know true uncorrupted Scripture, and the genuine sense thereof, how much more to know the true and uncorrupt writings of Fathers, and their genuine sense? consequently, the proof of the being of that Judge cannot depend on the testimony of the Fathers: Should the necessity of this infallible Judge never be believed until it be attested by the unanimous suffrage of Fathers, then none of the multitude should ever believe it. Are they able in such a thorny question, to find out the unanimous suffrage of Fathers? Surely either the necessity of this infallible Judge cannot be proved by Fathers, or this Pamphleter is most unhappy; for in all his *Fartago* of testimonies from Fathers, there is not one asserting this thing, as shall appear when I come to consider the objections. Nor 4. By *Traditions*; for, besides that I shall be addebted to any who will prove to me the Thesis here debated by Universal Tradition; are there not as great debates concerning genuine Traditions, and the sense of them as concerning Scriptures? Is there not need of an infallible visible Judge, to discri-

minate genuine Traditions from ſpurious? How was the Church impoſed upon by pretended Tradition, concerning the *Millennium*, and concerning the *Quarto-deciman* Controverſie, &c. If Tradition it ſelf muſt be Authorized by the infallible teſtimony of this Judge, then the infallibility of the Judge cannot be proved by Tradition; or if this Poſition can receive ſufficient evidence from Traditions, why may not other Articles of Faith alſo, and ſo there ſhould be no need of an infallible viſible Judge. Hence the great Sticklers for the Traditionary way are known to be but ſmall friends to the infallibility of a viſible Judge. Perhaps then 5. He run to *Miracles*: If there be a gift of Miracles among Romaniſts, are they not very uncharitable, who will ſend no Thaumaturgick Miſſionaries to *Scotland*? Do they judge us ſo credulous, as to be ſhaken with the fabulous Legends of Miracles, pretended to be wrought in the *Indies*, or in *Utopia*? I ſincerely profeſs, one real Miracle ſhould have more weight with me, than a million of their Pamphlets. Of Miracles, I hope to ſpeak more, *Cap.* 8. Now only I have two Queries. 1. When ever was there a true Miracle wrought to confirm this point of Controverſie, that there is a neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge? or that the Pope or his Council is this Judge? inſtance who can. 2. How is a true Miracle to be diſcerned from a falſe? I the rather enquire this, becauſe *Bell. lib. de not. Eccleſ. cap.* 14. poſitively affirms, that genuine Miracles muſt be known by the teſtimony of the Church; undoubtedly he means, this infallible viſible Judge: Then ſure the infallibility of this Judge is not to be proved by Miracles: But Circles and Labyrinths are fitteſt Engines to ſupport this myſtery of iniquity. Muſt we then 6. Believe this Judge to be infallible, *becauſe himſelf ſayes ſo*; Behold to what a pinch theſe men reduce Chriſtianity! Ye can have no ground, according to them, to believe Scripture, or Chriſt, or any Article of Religion, but upon the teſtimony of their infallible viſible Judge; that is, ſaith the Jeſuited party, the Pope of *Rome*. But how ſhall ye be aſſured that he is infallible? Ye muſt, forſooth, take this upon his own word. Is not this to make Chriſtianity ridiculous? Why ſhall I not as well believe a Quaker on his own word, who will affirm his Dreams with as great confidence as any Pope of *Rome*? is not this prodigious impiety? The Teſtimony of God ſpeaking in the Scriptures ſhall not be believed for it ſelf, albeit it have ſo ſtrong a confirmation from extrinſick motives of credibility, which the infallibility of Pope or Council never had, but the teſtimony of a Pope ſhall be believed infallible on his bare word.

word. Is not this to verifie that saying of our Saviour, Joh. 5. 43. *I am come in my Fathers Name, and me ye receive not; if another come in his own name, him ye will receive?* Must not these men have either Venal Consciences, or else be great Masters of their Reason, that can lay the stress of their Salvation upon so crazy a Foundation? Now 7. I know nothing that remains, except with the Quaker, they run to *Enthusiastical Revelations*, for this their pretended infallibility. And he may remember, how in a like case, I minded M. *Demster* of a discourse of *Cloppenburg*, the Title whereof is, *Papistarum & Enthusiastarum discordia concors.* Only both Romanist and Quaker must give us Protestants leave, to desire a sight of their Credentials, else we cannot take them for divinely inspired Prophets. This one negative Argument is sufficient to prove our negative Hypothesis, and to discover the fallacy of this ground of the Romish Religion. Perhaps my Adversary will say as another scribling Jesuit *E. W.* in his vain discourse, entituled, *Protestancy without Principles*, against two eminently Learned Persons, D. *Stillingfleet*, and M. *Poole*, *That we must positively prove that there is no infallible visible Judge*; but I must advertise him, to distinguish betwixt our Faith, and the rejection of their Errours, as no part of our Faith. It suffices a Protestant not to believe the necessity of any infallible visible Judge, and to declare that to be no part of our Faith; and this is abundantly warranted by this one negative Argument. Let the Pamphleter try how he can disprove it without Sophistry.

Argument 2. The Seat of this Infallibility, or this infallible visible Judge, is not assignable; therefore this infallible visible Judge is but a *Chymera*: The sequel I prove, Had God appointed an infallible visible Judge, upon whose testimony the Faith of all the Christian world should be resolved, he would surely have determined who this infallible Judge was, else, as M. *Poole* says well in his Appendix against *Everard*, *pag.* 16. God should deal with the World, as *Alexander* the Great, who when he was asked, to which of his Captains he left his Empire, answered, the best; but not defining who was best, this became a Seminary of contention, or, as another makes the comparison, like the dying Father, who having two Sons, *Leon*, and *Pantaleon*, and being enquired to whom he would leave his Estate, answered παντελεοντι; whereupon the two Brethren fell by the ears, the one alledging that he left παντα all, λεοντι to *Leon*; the other, that all was left παντελεοντι, to *Pantaleon*. Were it not Blasphemy to say, that God hath dealt so with his Church,

Church, aſſuring us that there is an infallible viſible Judge, but not revealing who he is? if it be not known who he is, people can no more reſolve their Faith upon his Authority, than if he were not: if therefore God had intended ſuch a way, ſurely he would have determined who he is. It remains therefore only that I prove the Antecedent, for which I need no more, but give an account of the diviſions of Romaniſts concerning this thing: if ſuch an infallible viſible Judge were aſſignable, could not Romaniſts, at leaſt, who talk ſo much of him, agree upon him? But who is ſuch a ſtranger in the world, as not to know their irreconcileable debates about this point? The Jeſuited party make the *Pope alone* the ſubject of this infallibility: So *Bell. lib. 4. de Pontif. cap. 3. Valent. Tom. 3. Diſp. 1. q. 1. punct. 7. Sect. 45. Gretſer Tom. 1. Defenſ. cap. 10. lib. 3. Bell. de verb. Dei Col.* 1450. with whom joyns *Stapleton, Cont. 6. q. 3. art. 5.* who affirms that infallibility is, *poteſtas & gratia perſonalis*, a perſonal power and grace given by Chriſt, *perſonæ* Petri *& ſucceſſorum ejus*, to the perſon of *Peter*, and his Succeſſors, and that it is ſo peculiar to the perſon of the Pope, that it cannot be ſo much as repreſentatively in the Council, and that it is not only falſe, but Heretical, to ſay that the Pope can err in *judicio Fidei*, in defining an Article of Faith. Yea, the Jeſuits of the Colledge of *Clermont* (as witneſſes *Hen. Foulis* in his Pretace to the Hiſtory of Romiſh Treaſons) emitted Theſes, *Anno* 1661. affirming that the Pope is infallible Judge of Controverſies, not only *extra Concilium* without a Council, but alſo that he is infallible in matters of Fact, as well as of Faith, which is more than *Bell.* durſt aver, as ſhall appear *Argument 6.* But there be on the other hand no leſs conſiderable Doctors, *Qui non in Pontifice ſed in Concilio Generali conſtituunt infallibilitatem judicii de rebus Fidei*, ſays *Bell. lib. 4. de Pontif. cap. 2.* who place this infallibility not at all in the Pope, but in the General Council only; and for this he cites the *Pariſian* Doctors, *Gerſon, Almaynus, Alphonſus à Caſtro*, yea and Pope *Adrian* the Sixth. Lo, here contradictory Opinions touching this thing among Romaniſts, and yet *Bell. lib. 4. de Pontif. cap. 2.* hath the confidence to ſay, *that all Romaniſts agree in this, that the Pope and the Council cannot err.* But this is both falſe on the matter, and a perfect Cheat. Firſt, I ſay falſe on the matter, for there be yet a third ſort of great Authors among Romaniſts, who do affirm, that both Pope and General Council may err in matters of Faith, and that the ſubject of infallibility, is *multitudo fidelium*, the diffuſive Body of Believers.

Of

Of this Opinion were *Occam*, *Panormitan*, *Petrus de Alliaco*, *Waldenſis*, *Antoninus*, Cardinal *Cuſan*, *Nicolaus de Clemanges:* The places ye will find cited by Learned D. *Barron*, in *Apodixi Catholica*, *Tract.* 5. *cap.* 19. 21. and by *H. H.* in his Review of the Apology for the Church of *Romes* infallibility, *Cap.* 1. *Sect.* 7. I will only cite one ſhort ſentence of famous *Occam*, *Part.* 1. *Dialog. lib.* 5. *cap.* 29. & 31. where he lays down this concluſion, and maintains it; *Tota multitudo clericorum poteſt contra fidem Catholicam errare & per conſequens totus clerus non eſt illa Eccleſia quæ contra fidem errare non poteſt.* That is the whole multitude of the Clergy may err againſt the Catholick Faith, and conſequently the whole Clergy is not that Church, which cannot err in matters of Faith. But ſecondly, thoſe Romaniſts who ſay they do agree in this, that the Pope and the Council cannot err, do put a Cheat upon the world, as is ſolidly demonſtrated by the Learned D. *Barron*, *Apodixi Catholica*, *tract.* 5. *cap.* 20. for they do not mean that this infallibility is partly ſeated in the Pope, and partly in the Councils, nor are they at all agreed concerning the ſeat of this infallibility; for the one half of them, namely the Jeſuited party, hold the Pope only to be the ſubject of this infallibi ity, and not the Council at all. Hence *Bell. lib.* 4. *de Pontif. cap.* 3. ſaith expreſly, *Totam firmitatem Conciliorum legitimorum eſſe à Pontifice, non partim à Pontifice, partim à Concilio.* The other half are as peremptory by *Bellarmine* his own confeſſion, that the infallibility is ſeated in the Council only, and not at all in the Pope. So that the Jeſuited party might as well ſay, that the Pope and M. *Con* are infallible, as that the Pope and the Council are infallible; and the other party might as well ſay, that the Council and M. *Con* were infallible, as the Council and the Pope. Yea, Jeſuits might ſay with as much candour, as D. *Barron* obſerves, *cap.* 20 *Sect.* 4. that they were agreed with Mahumetans, that the Pope and the Alcoran were infallible. By this alſo, I hope, it will appear how vainly they boaſt, as if by their infallible Judge they had an eaſie way to terminate Controverſies, and a ſure ground of Union amongſt themſelves; whereas the infallible Judge cannot agree them concerning this Fundamental of their Religion, nor terminate this controverſie among them, whether there be an infallible viſible Judge, or who he is. Neither can the Pamphleter make his eſcape by the tergiverſing evaſion he uſes, *pag.* 44. *That the queſtion is not, who this infallible Judge is, but whether there be one:* I ſay, thus he cannot eſcape, for I argue from the one to the other.

It

It cannot be shewed who is this infallible Judge, therefore there is none; both antecedent and sequel I have proved. Ought not the Pamphleter in this case, for resolving the *an sit*, whether there be such a Judge, define thee *quis sit*, who he is? it's the desperateness of the Cause that makes him sometimes tergiverse, and shun to declare who is the infallible Judge. But I doubt other times he be guilty of a greater trespass, he seems to be of the Jesuited party, and so of that Opinion, that the Pope alone is the seat of this infallibility: Yet often in this Pamphlet he gives out, as if he held Pope and Council conjunctly to be the infallible Judge. Must a Jesuit have liberty to equivocate, because it is his Principle? However I shut up this argument with a *Dilemma*. Either there is certainty of Faith, who is this infallible Judge, or not; if there be, I ask who he is, is it the Pope alone, then the *Parisian* Doctors, together with a very considerable Body of Romanists, must be Hereticks, who oppose that Article of Faith; if the Council alone, then the Jesuits and Jesuited party are damnable Hereticks for oppugning that Article of Faith; if both Pope and Council conjunctly, then (beside the difficulty of terminating Controversies when Pope and Council are divided, and that this destroys the Tenet of the necessity of an infallible visible Judge, for Councils seldom are) both the *Parisian* Doctors, and their party, and the Jesuits with their party, are Heretical, for they both place this infallibility either in the one or the other, but not in both conjunctly: if then they confess that there is no certainty of Faith, who is this infallible visible, seeing they cannot pitch upon him without charging the half of their own Church with Heresie: Then surely God hath not appointed an infallible visible Judge, in whose testimony our Faith is ultimately to be resolved. Had our gracious Lord appointed such a Judge, surely he would have told who he were, but not having defined who he is, certainly there is none: ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι.

Argument 3. Both Popes and Councils have erred grosly in matters of Faith; *Ergo*, both are infallibly fallible, and consequently there is no infallible visible Judge in the Church, none else pretending thereto. In confirmation of the antecedent, a whole Volumn might be written of the errours of Popes and Councils, *I* will only glean up a few, that it may appear what kind of infallible Judges these are, upon whose testimony Romanists would have all Christianity to hang.

And first for *Popes*; doth not *Gratian* in the Canon Law; *Dist.* 40. *cap.*

cap. Si Papa, ſay the Pope may be judged when he is *devius à fide*, that is, Heretical? Did not *Tertull. lib. contra Praxeam cap.* 1. characterize Pope *Zepherin*, or as other will have it, Pope *Eleutherius*, as a Montaniſt: Where alſo *Beatus Rhenanus* writes on the Margin of *Tertullian*, *Epiſcopus Romanus Montanizat.* Is it not acknowledged by *Platina* in *Vita Marcellini*, and recorded in the Ancient Martyrologies, yea in the Roman alſo, as is confeſſed by Jeſuit *Azorius*, *Part.* 2. *Moral. lib.* 5. *cap.* 5. that Pope *Marcelline* ſacrificed to *Jupiter*? Doth not *Athanaſius* in *Epiſt. ad ſolit. vit. agentes*, and *Hierom* in *Catal. virorum illuſtrium in Fortunationo*, ſay, that Pope *Liberius* ſubſcribed to the Arrian Hereſie, and to the damnation of *Athanaſius*? Is not *Felix*, who poſſeſſed the Papal Chair, *Liberius* being expulſed, charged with the ſame Hereſie by *Hierom* in *Catal. in Acatio*? Was not Pope *Anaſtaſius* the Second a Neſtorian, if we may credit *Alphonſus à Caſtro lib.* 1. *contra Hæreſ. cap.* 4. Is it not evident that Pope *Vigilius* was Anathematized by the fifth General Council? Are not the Cavils of *Baronius*, *Binnius*, and others, to vindicate *Vigilius* from Hereſie, ſolidly diſproved by *Crabanthorp* in a large Volumn concerning this fifth General Council; yea that Learned Author, *Cap.* 4. *Sect.* 20. ſpares not to infer, that not only Pope *Vigilius*, but alſo *Baronius*, *Bell. Greiſer*, *Pighius*, *Valentia*, and all Aſſerters of the Papal infallibility, are involved under the *Anathema*'s pronounced in the fifth General Council. Was not Pope *Honorius* a Monothelite? Did he not teach his Hereſie *ex Cathedrâ*, being conſulted, as to that matter, by *Sergius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*; and therefore was Anathematized by the ſixth General Council, and his Heretical Epiſtles ordained to be burned, *Act.* 13. This blot of *Honorius* ſo nettles the Jeſuited party, that they have forged a world of Subterfuges, but none of theſe Fig-tree leafs will cover the ſore; as beſide others, our Learned Country-man Doctor *John Forbes* of *Corſe* hath demonſtrated, *lib.* 5. *inſtruct. Hiſt. Theol. à cap.* 10. *ad* 31. What ſhould I mention the ſhameful work that was betwixt Pope *Formoſus*, *Romanus*, *Theodorus Secundus*, *John* 9. upon the one hand, and *Stephanus* the ſixth, and *Sergius* the third, on the other; of whom ſaith *Platina*, *in vita Romani*, *nihil aliud ibi cogitabant quam & nomen & dignitatem majorum ſuorum extinguere.* Neither were they only Controverſies of Fact which were agitated betwixt them, as *Bell.* alledges, for *Stephanus* and *Sergius* pronounced *Formoſus* no Pope, and his Acts and his Ordinations null, and all that were ordained by him to be reordained. Is the queſtion of Reordination,

whether Ordinations made by *Formoſus* were valid, whether all the time of *Formoſus* there was any Pope, and conſequently whether there were any infallible Judge, meer queſtions of fact? Are they not at leaſt ſuch queſtions of fact, that on them depend queſtions of Faith and Manners? Nay, this Papal rage ſwelled ſo high, that *Formoſus* is raiſed by *Sergius* out of his Grave, diſmembred, and thrown into *Tiber*. What ſhall I ſay of that Brand of Hell, *Gregory* the ſeventh, of whom Cardinal *Benno* gives this character, in *lib. de vita Greg.* 7. that he was an Murtherer, an Adulterer, a Necromancer, a Schiſmatick, a Heretick, and the worſt of Mortals. There be black characters ſet upon him by many other Hiſtorians: Yet I wonder not to ſee *Bellarmine*, and the Jeſuited party, to plead ſo hardly for him, for their Treaſonable and Heretical Principles of the Popes Juriſdiction above Princes, diſcover them to be diſpoſed to trace the footſteps of that perfidious Pope. Was not he the man that ſtirred up *Rodolph* of *Suevia* againſt his Maſter *Henry* the Fourth, and wrote upon the Imperial Crown which he ſent to him.

Petra dedit Petro, Petrus Diadema Rodolpho.

Did not Pope *Celeſtine* 3. Heretically aſſert, that Hereſie deſtroys the Band of Matrimony, as teſtifies *Alphonſus à Caſtro, lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. Did not Pope *John* the 22. deny that Souls of Saints are admitted to the Beatifical Viſion before the Day of Judgment? Yea, and impoſed it upon the Univerſity of *Paris*, that they ſhould graduate none in Theology, except they did ſwear to maintain that Hereſie all the days of their life, as *Alphonſus à Caſtro lib.* 3. *de Hæreſ. tit: Beatitudo Hæreſ.* 6. brings in *Adrian* the ſixth witneſſing. How piteous an evaſion makes *Bell.* for him, as if this might have been taught by him without Hereſie before the Council of *Florence*. Can the Church make that to be Heretical, which was not Heretical; that *de fide*, which was not *de fide*? If ſhe may not, then *Bellarmin*'s Apology for Pope *John* 22. is null: if ſhe may, then beſides, that they who affirm this, ought by ſolid reaſons to inſtruct ſuch a Power, ſhe rather does hurt than good, for by her definitions, ſhe makes that Sin which was not Sin, and that Hereſie which was not Hereſie. But there was a more grievous Monſter of that name, *John* 23. who is ſaid to have affirmed that the Souls of men are Mortal, and periſh like the Souls of Bruits. The words of the Council of *Conſtance*, *Seſſ.* 11. concerning him are, *Dixit & pertinaciter credidit animam hominis cum corpore humano mori & extingui, adinſtar animarum*

animarum brutorum. Bell. lib. 4. *de Pontif. cap.* 14. to wipe off ſo foul a ſtain from the Papacy queſtions, if he were a lawful Pope. But *Platina* tells he was choſen at *Bononiæ omnium conſenſu.* It's more ſpecious which the Cardinal adds, that though his Infidelity was Libelled againſt him, yet not proved. To ſhew that I love to do right to the worſt of Popes, I do acknowledge, that in the Proceſs I find not particular mention of the probation of this Article: Yet I muſt add, that the Council would never have ſuſtained this, as a Relevant Indictment to be Libelled againſt a Pope, if they had not ſuppoſed that a Pope could be guilty thereof. And beſides, he was really convicted by the Council of moſt Atrocious Crimes, inſomuch that he was commonly called a Devil Incarnate. Who will ſay that ſuch a man had immunity from Hereſie or Infidelity, let be from all Errour. It's irkſome to me to rake further in this Dunghill: Have not ſome Popes been groſs Ignorants, *adeo illiterati ut Grammaticam neſcirent,* ſaid *à Caſtro* in the firſt Editions of his Work, *de Hæreſ. lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. though in the ſubſequent impreſſions, as *Whittaker* obſerves, *Controv.* 4. *q.* 6. *cap.* 3. he ſuffered a Caſtration. Some Children, as *Bennet* the 9. a Boy of ten years of Age, if *Glaber* may be credited, a Writer of that time, to whom *Bell. de Script. Eccleſ.* gives this character that, *Scripſit ſatis accuratè.* Yet ſuch flattering Sycophants are Jeſuits, that *Bell.* is not aſhamed to ſay, *lib.* 4. *de Pontif. cap.* 5. If the Pope ſhould command vices, and prohibit vertues, all men were bound to believe vice to be good, and vertue to be evil.

Who deſire a more full Catalogue of Erronious and Heretical Popes, and a confutation of the Apologies which Jeſuited Romaniſts have deviſed for them with more ingeniouſneſs than ingenuity, may conſult our Learned Controverſiſts. *Albertus Pighius*, notwithſtanding theſe, and many ſuch like luculent inſtances of erring Popes, yet is not aſhamed to mention, *that the Pope cannot err in matters of Faith*, no not ſo much *as a private perſon*: But for this he is juſtly chaſtiſed by his own Fellows, *Melchior Canus loc. com. lib.* 6. *cap. ult.* and Jeſuit *Azorius*, *Part.* 2. *Moral. lib.* 5. *cap.* 5. *q.* 2. Others, as is teſtified by *Azorius*, *cap. cit. q.* 3. have the confidence to ſay, that the Pope cannot err, at leaſt in his publick definitions concerning Faith, or Manners, *Etſi abſque ullo conſilio & diligentia rem fidei aut morum definiat*; that is, though he take no counſel, nor uſe any means to find out the truth. With theſe *Greg. de Valentia* ſeems to go along, *lib.* 8. *de Annal. fid. cap.* 10. but this alſo is judiciouſly confuted by *Melchior Canus loc. com. lib.* 5. *cap.* 5. who affirms they might

as rationally expect a plenteous Harveſt, though there were neither Tilling nor Sowing. Nor is their ordinary evaſion leſs ludibrious, *that though the Pope may err as a private perſon, yet not as a Pope; defining ex Cathedrâ.* Well, did *Whittaker cont. 4. de Pontific. q. 6. cap. 3.* redargue that evaſion with the ſaying of *Æſchines* againſt *Cteſiphon*, *Qui privatim improbus eſt nunquam poteſt publice probus eſſe; & qui domi nequam eſt, ille ne in Macedonia quidem honeſtus & bonus fuit.* If the Pope be an Heretick in his Cloſet, how ſhall he be Orthodox in his Chair? Doth the Spirit of God prompt him to define in *Cathedrâ*, contrary to his private judgment? or hath he a promiſe of Illumination how ſoon he ſteps up to his Chair? What needed then a Judicial Proceſs againſt *John* the 23. for Hereſie? Had there not been a more eaſie way to reduce him to an Orthodox mind, by ſetting him to define *ex Cathedrâ*? Can Romaniſts agree among themſelves, when he ſpeaks *ex Cathedrâ*? Doth not Learned D. *Barron* in *Apodex. Cathol. tract. 5. cap. 10.* rehearſe a multitude of their ſtaggering conjectures as to that thing? Is there not need of an infallible Oracle to tell us when he ſpeaks *ex Cathedrâ*, that we may know when he ſpeaks infallibly, and when heretically? Would it not appear that *Honorius* defined *ex Cathedra* for the Monothelite Hereſie, when he was conſulted by the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* concerning that Controverſie? Did not Pope *Vigilius* define *ex Cathedrâ*, when he declared *ex Authoritate ſedis Apoſtolicæ*, in his *Conſtitutum* which was exhibited to *Juſtin.* the Emperor and to the fifth General Council, the Epiſtle written by *Ibas* Biſhop of *Edeſſa* againſt *Cyril*, and againſt the *Epheſine* Council, to be Orthodox, which was found by the fifth Gen. Council to contain moſt impious, heretical, and Neſtorian Principles? Is it not a ludibrious evaſion of others to ſay, *The Pope as Pope cannot be a Heretick, becauſe how ſoon he turns Heretick, he ceaſes to be Pope.* *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, ſays they who anſwer thus, *Jocantur in re ſeria*; and in effect attribute no more infallibility to the Pope, than to the meaneſt believing Collier; every Believer in this ſenſe is infallible, namely in *ſenſu compoſito*, for how ſoon he turns Heretick, he ceaſes to be a true Believer; if every private Hereſie degrade a Pope, how then ſhall we know who is Pope, or graced with infallible aſſiſtance, ſeeing we cannot be certain but he entertains ſome private Hereſie? Among all the Subterfuges of Romaniſts, I know none more ludibrious than that of *Greg. de Val. Tom. 3. Diſp. 1. q. 1. punct. 7. col. 233.* (wherein yet they chiefly confide) viz *that the Pope may be ſmitten with a manifeſt errour, or with an errour againſt*

which

which the Church hath given a prior definition, and may endeavour to obtrude it upon others by his definitive Sentence, but that he cannot give Sentence for an errour not manifeſt, or for an errour againſt which the Church hath paſſed no former definition. I am ſure there is no *Veſtige* either in Scripture or Antiquity for ſuch a diſtinction, nor yet is it agreeable to ſound Reaſon, it being much more eaſie to fall into an errour not manifeſt, than into a manifeſt errour, there being more means to preſerve from manifeſt, than from not manifeſt errours; if therefore the Popes infallibility doth not ſecure him againſt manifeſt errours, much leſs againſt not manifeſt errours: if the Scriptures alledged for infallibility prove not his immunity from manifeſt errours, how ſhall his immunity from not manifeſt errours from them to be concluded. The Pope, as a private perſon, may be ſmitten with a not manifeſt errour by the confeſſion of *Valentia*; if then the exigence of the Church require a deciſion of that Controverſie, muſt not the Pope diſcern according to his private errour? It's a piteous off come of the Jeſuit, that God will take away the Pope by death, leſt he ſhould paſs ſentence for ſuch an errour. A goodly paſs indeed to which his *Infallibility* is brought; M. *Demſter*, and this Pamphleter, ſpake of *Infallibility* as a ſpecial aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt guiding their Judge unto all truth, but now it's turned to an act of ſeverity in killing the Pope, leſt he ſhould give out an erronious ſentence. But ſeeing God in the depth of his Judgment hath ſpared Popes to confirm manifeſt errours by their ſentences, who ſhall aſſure us that he will not permit them alſo to confirm not manifeſt errours? To this it's anſwered, *That there is more hazard to the Church by a not manifeſt errour, than by a manifeſt one; for when the Pope defines contrary to a prior definition, then he is known to be a Wolf, and not a Paſtor; but when he defines a not manifeſt errour, then there is no mean left to know him to be an Impoſtor, and ſo the Church were bound to aſſent to his erronious Sentence.* But this Reply takes for granted two manifeſt untruths. Firſt, that there is no ground by which to diſcern Truth from Errour, but the definition of the Church, whereas, when the Church is firſt to define a Truth, ſhe muſt have ſome ſure ground why ſhe gives Sentence for this rather than for the contradictory thereof, conſequently there muſt be a ground by which to diſcern Truth from Errour antecedent to the Churches Sentence. Secondly, that the Church is bound to aſſent to the erronious Sentence of a Pope: But where ever did God ſo far inſlave the Conſciences of his people to erronious Teachers?

ers? Moreover, the hazard to the Romiſh Church appears to be much the ſame, whether the Errour for which the Pope defines be manifeſt or not, for by his definition it becomes not manifeſt to them, he having a multitude of Paraſites to deviſe diſtinctions and gloſſes to elude prior definitions, as either not being definitions of the Church, or not contrary to this. As fell out when *Leo* the 10. paſſed his Sentence in the *Lateran* Council for the Popes Supremacy, contrary to the definitions of the Church in the Councils of *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, how many Advocates were ſet on work to maintain that theſe definitions of *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, were no definitions of the Church, or of Oecumenick Councils? In a word, ſo manifeſt it is that Popes may err in *Cathedrâ* concerning matters of Faith, that the ſame is aſſerted by eminent Romiſh Doctors, as *Gerſon*, *Almaynus*, Pope *Adrian* 6. *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, &c. cited by *Melchior Canus lib.* 6. *loc. com. cap.* 1. and by *Azorius*, *Part.* 2. *Moral. lib.* 5. *cap.* 4. Yea the Jeſuited Doctrine of Papal Infallibility is pronounced by *Thomas*, *Ab Albiis in Sono Buccinæ*, *tract.* 2. *Sect.* 22. not only *Hæretica*, but *Archihæretica & mater ſpurciſſimorum errorum*, that is ſuperlatively Heretical, and the ſource of peſtilent errours: What need I more? Doth not Pope *Innocent* the 3. confeſs the fallibility of Popes, *Serm.* 2. *de Conſec. propter ſolum peccatum quod in fide committitur*, *poſſum ab Eccleſia Judicari*: if Pope *Innocent* truly affert the fallibility of Popes, then ſurely they are fallible, and if falſly by his falſe Aſſertion he demonſtrated that Infallibility was not tyed to his Chair.

Next, as to *Councils*, Proteſtants have much more reſpect for real Oecumenick Synods, conſiſting of Paſtors from all true Churches of Jeſus Chriſt, than any Jeſuited Papiſts. Proteſtants acknowledge, that real Oecumenick Synods are the Supreme viſible Eccleſiaſtick Judge of Controverſies of Religion; and that they have choice promiſes of God for their aſſiſtance, if they ſincerely ſeek his glory, and the diſcovery of truth: Yet there not being promiſes, that all the members of an Oecumenick Synod, or greater part of them, ſhall infallibly obſerve the conditions upon which that aſſiſtance of the Spirit may be expected. Nay, on the contrary, ſeeing in theſe Meetings much may be done through faction or intereſt, and thoſe who come thither in ſimplicity may be byaſſed by the influence of others, therefore we cannot aſſert an abſolute infallibility of Councils. But Jeſuited Papiſts are ſo far injurious to Councils, that they will not have Councils to be acknowledged, except they be called by the Pope, and ſwear ſubjection to him: Yea, and they ſuſpend

ſpend all their infallibility upon the ratification of the Pope. *Bell. lib. 4. de Pontif. cap. 1.* deals plainly; *Conciliorum Judicium tum firmum & ratum eſt, quum acceſſerit ſummi Pontificis confirmatio, proinde ultimum judicium eſt ſummi Pontificis*; ſo they eſteem of Councils only as they ſerve their intereſts. Upon this account, *Bell. lib. 1. de Concil. cap. 4.* divides Councils into thoſe that are approved, and thoſe that are not approved; thoſe that are partly approved, and partly diſapproved, and thoſe that are neither approved, nor diſapproved. Hence *Vives* in *lib. 20. Auguſt. de civit. Dei cap. 28. Itaque illa Demum iis videntur edicta & concilia quantum in rem ſuam faciunt, reliqua non pluris æſtimant quam conventum mulierecularum in textrina vel thermis.* By this it may be judged whether we or Romaniſts deſer moſt reſpect to Councils.

That Councils have erred, may be demonſtrated by ſad inſtances; It were eaſie to ſhew, that late Popiſh Councils are patched up of as many groſs errours, as there be points in difference betwixt Romaniſts and us: I only mention three of thoſe, ſo luculently repugnant to clear Scriptures, and the Ancient Church, that he who runs may read. And firſt, What wit of men can clear from errour the Decree of the Council of *Conſtance Seſſ. 13.* wherein *the half Communion was enacted*, and that with a *non obſtante*, both to Chriſts Inſtitution, and to the practiſe of the Primitive Church. Secondly, Is it poſſible for any man to reconcile the Decree of the Council of *Trent, Seſſ. 22. Can. 9. of celebrating the Worſhip of God in an unknown tongue*; with *1 Cor. cap. 14. v. 11.* If I know not the meaning of the voice, I ſhall be to him that ſpeaketh a Barbarian, and he a Barbarian to me. Then ſure the Council of *Trent* eſtabliſheth a barbarous Worſhip in the Church, inſomuch that their own *Cajetan* on *1 Cor. 14.* ſaith, *Ex hac* Pauli *Doctrina habetur quod melius ad ædificationem Eccleſiæ eſt orationes publicas, quæ audiente populo dicuntur dici lingua communi & clericis & populo, quam dici Latinè.* Thirdly, Doth not the Decree of the ſecond Council of *Nice*, and of *Trent, concerning the Religious Adoration of Images*, directly contradict the Scripture, *Exod. 20. 5.* yea, and the Univerſal practiſe of the Ancient Church. They may ſee this from their own *Picherell. in diſſert. de imag.* but theſe, and ſuch like inſtances, would ingage me upon the proſecution of other Controverſies.

I ſhall therefore now hint at a few other examples; and firſt I would have Romaniſts reſolve, whether the General Council of *Chalcedon* did err when it enacted, *Act. 15. Can. 28.* and *Act. 16.*

that

that the Patriarchs of Conſtantinople *have equal priviledges with the Biſhop of* Rome. If it did err, then General Councils may err; if not, then the Supremacy of the Pope of *Rome* falls to the ground. I know *Baronius*, *Binnius*, and *Becanus*, alledge that Act to be of no force, as not being approved by the Pope of *Rome*, and his Legats. But it rather follows, that the Fathers of the Primitive Church were not of the preſent Romiſh Faith, concerning the Popes Supremacy, and the dependance of the force of Decrees of General Councils upon the Popes approbation: For though the Popes Legats, who had withdrawn themſelves from the Council at the firſt making of this Canon, did deſire the Act to be reſcinded, and repreſented the diſſent of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and ſpared not to ſuggeſt that it was carried on in a diſorderly and factious way, the whole Council unanimouſly adhered to the Act, and cryed out, *Hæc juſta ſententia, hoc omnes dicimus, quæ conſtituta ſunt valeant, omnia recte Decreta ſunt.* Sure either this Conſil deſtroys the Popes Supremacy, or if it erred, the infallibility of Councils falls to the ground.

Did not the ſecond Council of *Epheſus* err groſly in giving ſentence for the *Eutychean Hereſie?* And the Council of *Sirmium*, *Ariminum*, *Antioch*, *Tyre*, &c. who did approve, or at leaſt interpolate the *Arrian Hereſie*? Nor will it ſalve the matter to ſay, that they were unlawful Councils. For what made them unlawful? Not the want of a due Authority, they being Convocated by Imperial Edicts, as well as the four famous uncontroverted General Councils, and ſome of them were very numerous, only they were unlawful, becauſe they pronounced erroneous Decrees. Perhaps it will be replyed, that they were not approved by the Biſhop of *Rome*; if that rendred them invalid, how came it that the Ancient Fathers, when they were urged with the Authority of thoſe Councils, did not caſt them on that account? Can a Poſt-nate approbation of the Pope make that true which in it ſelf was falſe? What a goodly infallibility of a Council is that, which ariſes from the Ratification of the Pope; as if a Council began to be infallible, after it had ceaſed to be? I can imagine no tolerable ſenſe in this, but that the Council of it ſelf is fallible, and that the whole infallibility is to be refounded on the Pope. But that Popes have erred, both in the Chair, and out of the Chair, I hope I have already proved: What need I more? Have not Councils alſo approved by Popes erred? Was it not an abſurd errour in the *Council of Neo-Cæſarea*, approved

proved by Pope *Leo* the 4. as appears by *Gratia dist.* 20. *cap. de libellis, to condemn Can.* 7. *second Marriages*? Was it not a Cyclopick errour in the *Roman Council*, approved by Pope *Nicolas* the 2. to hold the true Body of Christ in the Sacrament, *sensualiter tractari, frangi & dentibus atteri*, to be sensually handled, broken and torn with teeth? Was it not an errour repugnant both to Scripture and Antiquity in the *Lateran Council*, under Pope *Alexander* the 3. *Can.* 1. *de conjugatis, to give leave to persons solemnly and lawfully married to recede from their Vow, so as the one, without the consent of the other, may enter into a Monastick life, declaring thereby the Marriage to be dissolved*? The evasions whereby Romanists would cloak these impious errours, are judiciously refuted by the Learned *Davenant*, *de Jud. controv. cap.* 23. Was not the sixth General Council, and the Canons thereof, which by some are termed *Canones Synodi quin Sextæ*, approved by Pope *Adrian* 1. in his Epistle to *Tharasius* in *Act.* 2. *Concil.* 2. *Nic.* Doth he not there call them *Canones Jure ac Divinitus ab ipsis promulgatos*, or as it is in the Greek, ενθεσμως και θειωδως; yet it cannot be denied but several of these Canons are erroneous, as *Can.* 2. *approving the Council of* Carthage *under* Cyprian, *which established Rebaptization, and the* 72 *Canon, which dissolves Marriage betwixt persons of different perswasions.* Yea Romanists now ordinarily condemn these Canons; and the rather, because some of them so little favour their interest, especially *Can.* 36. which equalizes the Bishop of *Constantinople* to the Roman. Might not instances be given of Councils confirmed by Popes decreeing contradictions? Were there not contradictory Councils at *Constantinople* in the ninth Century, concerning *Photius* and *Ignatius*, approved by the Legats of the Popes of *Rome*, and both declared Oecumenical, by no less testimony than the Latin or Greek Church? Did not *Bell. lib. de Imag. cap.* 8. *Sect. ultimo probatur*, say, that the Council of *Trent* did admit the picturing of God the Father? Yet *Dallæus lib.* 4. *de Imag. cap.* 8. hath sufficiently evicted, that it was disallowed by the second Council of *Nice*, confirmed by Pope *Adrian* the 1. though otherwise too too grosly idolatrous. The contradictions betwixt the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* on the one hand, defining the Council to be above the Pope, and of the *Lateran* under *Leo* the 10. on the other, defining *Sess.* 11. the Pope to be above the Council; are so evident, that Jesuit *Azorius Part.* 2. *Instit. Moral lib.* 4. *cap.* 15. cannot deny them; and thereupon he acknowledges Romanists to be divided into two contrary Factions. Yet as the *Lateran* Council was

approved by *Leo*, ſo was the Council of *Conſtance* by Pope *Martin* 5. *Seſſ.* 45. Can Popes confirm contradictions without errour, unleſs it be ſaid, as the Jewiſh *Rabbins* did of the contradictions betwixt the Houſes of *Shammai* and *Hillel*. *Utraque ſunt verba Dei viventis*, both parts of the contradiction are not only true, but alſo the words of the living God.

Is this any new Aſſertion of Proteſtants, that Councils are fallible? Was not this taught by *Auſtin* in many places, particularly in that luculent teſtimony, *lib.* 2. *de Baptiſm contra Donatiſt. cap.* 3. which I had cited againſt Jeſuit *Demſter*, wherein *Auſtin* preſers the holy Scriptures to all writings of Popes and Councils, and in the end concludes, *Plenaria Concilia priora à poſterioribus emendari*, that the former Plenary or Oecumenick Councils, may be corrected by the poſteriour; therefore he ſuppoſes that Plenary Councils may be ſmitten with errour. To this the Pamphleter replys, *pag.* 43. *that* Auſtin *ſpeaks not there of deciſions of Faith*, which he borrows from *Bell. lib.* 2. *de concil. cap.* 7. but it hath been often confuted; for the queſtion which *Auſtin* is there diſputing, is a queſtion of Faith; *namely, whether the Baptiſm of Hertticks be real Baptiſm, and whether they who are baptized by Hereticks ſhould be rebaptized.* The Donatiſts to confirm their Opinion, alledged the Authority of *Cyprian*, and the Council of *Carthage* under him: *Auſtin* therefore to enervate that Objection, ſhews that Scripture is to be preferred to the writings both of Fathers and Councils, and that former Councils, though Plenary and Oecumenick, may be corrected by ſucceeding Councils. This Anſwer had been impertinent, had he only been ſpeaking of *queſtions of Fact*, and not *of Faith*: For the Donatiſts muſt have replyed, though Councils may err in matters of Fact, yet the preſent queſtion betwixt them and him was dogmatical, yea the words of *Auſtin*, which the Pamphleter, tracing *Bell.* footſteps, doth urge for his expoſition, do make againſt him, for he ſays not only that Prior Councils are amended by Poſteriour, *quum aliquo rerum experimento aperitur quod clauſum eſt*, which is done in matters of Fact, but alſo *quum cognoſcitur quod latebat*, which is done in matters of Faith; which alſo is obſerved by *Stapleton*, *controv* 6. *q.* 3. *art.* 4. *ad.* 1. *arg.* And therefore he betakes himſelf to another evaſion; namely, *that ſubſequent Councils are ſaid to correct former Councils, only becauſe they explain more dilucidly what was wrapt up more obſcurely in former Councils.* But this ſurely is repugnant to the ſcope of *Auſtin*, who to refute the Objection of the Donatiſts from the the Authority of *Cyprian* and the Council of *Carthage*, holds forth this

this as the priviledge of the Scriptures above all teſtimonies of Fathers and Councils, whether National or Plenary, that of the truth of things delivered in Scripture, *dubitari & diſceptari non poſſit*, it was not lawful at all to doubt: But Councils National do yield to Plenary Councils, and latter Plenary Councils do correct the former, whereas if he only meant, that the latter Councils do illuſtrate and explain the former, no priviledge ſhould be aſcribed to the Scriptures beyond Councils, for one Scripture may likewiſe illuſtrate another: It's beyond doubt, when he ſaith, that National Councils cede to thoſe that are Plenary, he means that National Councils may err; therefore when he ſays, that ſubſequent Plenary Councils may correct former Councils, he means alſo, that Plenary Councils may err. Was the Pamphleter ſo ignorant, that he knew not that the evaſion which he took from *Bell.* was anſwered by Proteſtants; or if he knew, why endeavours he not the vindication thereof. But his work appears to have been all along to pick up any thing that ſeemed to make for him out of other Popiſh Books, not once noting what had been replyed thereto.

Laſtly, I cannot omit the obſerve of *Thomas ab Albiis in ſono Buccinæ tract.* 2. *Sect.* 21. that before any can be aſſured of the infallible aſſiſtance of the Spirit given to Councils in their Judicial Deciſions, they cannot but be intangled with a world of perplexed debates, as to what Councils, and in what caſes this infallible aſſiſtance is due, concerning the Convocation of Councils, the power of preſiding in them, the preſence of Delegates from all Churches, the manner of Conciliary procedure, the number and weight of ſuffrages, their confirmation, and the reception of Councils by all Churches; Do they not ſhut up Souls in inextricable Labyrinths, who make their Faith to hang on ſuch thorny diſputes? I ſhall cloſe this diſcourſe, concerning Councils, with three teſtimonies, two from Fathers, and a third from a famed modern Romaniſt. The firſt ſhall be from *Athanaſius, Epiſt. de Synod. Arimin. & Seleuc. pag.* 873. *edit. Pariſ.* 1627. *fruſtra igitur circumcurſitantes prætexunt ob fidem ſe Synodos poſtulare cum ſit Scriptura potentior omnibus*; that is, in vain do they run about, demanding Synods for eſtabliſhing Faith, ſeeing the Scripture is more powerful than all Councils: The other is from *Nazianzen, Epiſt. ad Procop. Si vera ſcribere oportet, ita animo affectus ſum, ut omnia Epiſcoporum Concilia fugiam, quoniam nullius Concilii finem lætum fauſtumque vidi*; that is, to ſpeak the truth, I am ſo diſpoſed, that I deſire to ſee no more Councils, for

I never ſaw any of them had a good and comfortable iſſue. I do not mention this teſtimony of *Nazianzen* to diſcredit all Councils, God forbid, I impute only that whereof he complains to the iniquity of thoſe times; yet by this teſtimony it clearly appears, that the Father judged not Councils abſolutely infallible. The third teſtimony from a modern Romaniſt, *Thomas ab Albiis in Sono buccine, tract.* 2. *Sect.* 22. touches both Popes and Councils, where he compares the (ſuppoſed) corruption of the Rule of Faith made by Hereticks, (ſo he deſigns Proteſtants) to an Ulcer in the Skin, and outward parts of the body, which is not ſo very dangerous; but he reſembles the aſcribing of Judiciary Infallibility to Pope or Council, whereby they are exalted above all that is called God, unto an Ulcer in the bowels, which diffuſes its poyſon through the vitals, and kills the perſon: And ſo much of this Argument 3.

Argument 4. If there be an infallible viſible Judge, he muſt proceed in giving definitions of Faith either diſcurſively, or by Prophetical inſpiration, but by neither of theſe ways can he proceed; *ergo, &c.* If any challenge the enumeration in the major, it concerns him to aſſign another way of his procedure, till which, I proceed to confirm the minor. And 1. Doth this Judge proceed by *Prophetical Inſpiration?* Are all the Popes of *Rome* Prophets? Had Pope *Pius* the 4. *Martin* the 5. *Eugenius* the 4 *Leo* the 10. or the conſtituent Members of the Council of *Conſtance, Baſil, Florence, Lateran,* or *Trent,* Prophetical Inſpirations? Where are their extraordinary Credentials correſpondent to ſuch extraordinary Inſpirations? The Apoſtles ſpake with Tongues, and wrought Miracles: Had Pope *Paul* the 3. *Julius* the 3. *Pius* the 4. or the *Trent* Biſhops, ſuch Seals of their Apoſtleſhip? Is there not as good cauſe to believe the Divine Inſpirations of deluded *Quakers,* as of Popes, or Papalings? Muſt all be believed to be divinely inſpired, who ſay they are? Hath not God left us a Rule by which to judge of Impoſtors? And what elſe is that Rule but the holy Scripture, *Iſai.* 8. 20. Is not this a goodly iſſue of Papal infallibility? Papiſts and Quakers are not ſuch Enemies as they would make the World believe. Some may think, perhaps, I play upon Romaniſts, when I charge them with Enthuſiaſms, but I do them no wrong; it's the Doctrine of their own greateſt Authors. *Stapleton controv.* 4. *q.* 2. *in explicat. Art. Notab.* 4. ſaith, *That the Doctrine of the Church,* undoubtedly he means this infallible viſible Judge, *is diſcurſiva in mediis,* but *Prophetica & Divina in concluſionibus,* Divine and Prophetical in the concluſi-

ons,

ons, though only discursive in the premises. I doubt if more ludibrious non-sense, concerning Enthusiasms, ever dropt from a Quaker. Justly doth Judicious *Rivet* in *Isagog. ad Scripturam cap.* 20. *Sect.* 8. censure this Doctrine of *Stapletons*, as repugnant to it self. For to use discourse to infer a conclusion, and yet to expect that the conclusion shall not be inferred by argumentation, but only be suggested by Enthusiasm, or Divine Inspiration, *et velle & nolle argumentari*: Surely the definitions of this infallible Judge not depending upon the premises, nor being inferred by them, but being divinely inspired, according to *Stapleton*, they cannot properly be conclusions, but must be Divine Oracles; is not this to establish perfect Enthusiasm? were this a truth, ought not the definitions of this infallible Judge be joyned to the holy Scripture? Neither want there Authors among Romanists who assert this; as *Testefort* the Dominican, cited by *Rivet*, *cap. cit. Sect.* 9. who affirmed, *Sacram Scripturam contineri partim in bibliis partim in decretalibus Pontificum Romanorum*: And *Melchior Canus*, *lib.* 5. *cap.* 5. testifies, that one of their Learned Doctors affirmed in his presence *definitiones Conciliorum ad Sacram Scripturam pertinere*. May I not here use the word of the Prophet, *Jer.* 23. 28. *What is the Chaff to the Wheat, saith the Lord?* it may be enough to prove the falshood of that way, that many eminent Doctors of the Romish perswasion are ashamed of it, particularly *Bell. lib.* 4. *de verb. Dei cap.* 9. *lib.* 2. *de Conciliis cap.* 12. *Melchior Canus lib.* 2. *cap.* 7. *Alphonsus à Castro lib.* 1. *cap.* 8. *Bectrall. de fide cap.* 2. *q.* 8. *Sect.* 4. who all are ashamed to assert, that Popes and Councils pass out their definitions by immediate Revelations: And the University of *Paris*, *Anno* 1626. emitted a Decree, condemning the foresaid impious assertion of *Testefort*, as witnesses *Rivet Isagog. cap.* 20. *Sect.* 9. who would have a more full account of the Fanaticism and Enthusiasms of the Church of *Rome*, I remit them to D. *Stillingfleet*'s late discourse of Romish Idolatry, *cap.* 4. If therefore they say that this Judge proceeds discursively, which was the other branch of the Assumption, I argue against them thus: 1. Then this infallible Judge must have a clear and infallible, yea, and a publick ground (for now he proceeds not by secret Enthusiasm) from which he deduces his definitions; and if the Judge antecedently to his definitions have a clear ground to believe that which he is to define, why may not others also believe upon the same clear grounds, without the sentence of an infallible visible Judge? Certainly either the Judge defines an Article of Faith, which himself does not

not believe, but conſequently to his own definition, and becauſe he ſays it himſelf, or if he believe it before he define it, then an infallible viſible Judge is not neceſſary; For that, without which Faith may be had, is not ſimply neceſſary to Faith, but Faith may be had without the ſentence of an infallible viſible Judge, as appears in that antecedent Act of Faith which the Judge hath before his own ſentence; therefore the ſentence of an infallible viſible Judge is not ſimply neceſſary to Faith: or if Romaniſts will needs ſtill maintain it to be neceſſary, it will be neceſſary, and not neceſſary, neceſſary *ex Hypotheſi*, not neceſſary, becauſe the Judge hath Faith antecedently to his ſentence. Is it not a Noble Poſition which drives the Aſſerters thereof either upon the Rock of Enthuſiaſm, or elſe involves them in a contradiction? But ſecondly, this Judge proceeding diſcurſively in his definition of Faith, is fallible in the premiſes, *ergo*, he is fallible alſo in the concluſion: The ſequel is clear, it being impoſſible to deduce a true concluſion from falſe premiſes. Whatever may ſeem to follow *ratione formæ*, yet nothing can *ratione materiæ*, ſeeing, as Philoſophers demonſtrate, *aſſenſus concluſionis attingit objectum præmiſſarum*, if therefore the premiſes be falſe, the concluſion muſt be likewiſe falſe: The antecedent is acknowledged by Romaniſts themſelves. Hence *Stapleton, controv. 4. q. 2. in explic. art. Notab. 2. Eccleſia in ſingulis mediis non habet infallibilitatem & peculiarem S. Sancti directionem ſed poteſt in illis adhibendis probabili interdum non ſemper neceſſaria collectione uti. Ratio eſt quia Eccleſiaſtici non habent ſcientiæ divinæ plenitudinem, ſic de ſeipſo dixit Auguſt. Epiſt. 119. cap. 11. in Scripturis Sanctis multo interdum plura neſciunt quam ſciunt, nihilominus Eccleſia in concluſione fidei ſemper eſt certiſſima.* Let me now appeal all knowing perſons, if either Scripture or Fathers do teſtifie, that God gifts any with infallibility in the concluſion, and not alſo in the premiſes: Were not the Apoſtles infallible in both? Seeing therefore Popes ſucceed not to *Peter* in his infallibility in the premiſes, neither do they ſucceed him in his infallibility in the concluſion.

Arg. 5. It's impoſſible for Romaniſts, eſpecially the Jeſuited party, according to their Principle, to know infallibly who is truly Pope, or which is truly a lawful Council; *ergo*, it's impoſſible that they can infallibly reſolve their Faith upon the ſentence of an infallible viſible Judge: The ſequel is good, becauſe that they may reſolve their Faith upon the teſtimony of an infallible Judge, it is neceſſary that they know him to be ſuch, and there is none pretending to be

that

that infallible Judge, but either Pope or General Council, or both joyntly. The antecedent is proved by a threefold medium. 1. From the caſe of Schiſm. 2. Of Simony. 3. Of the want of due intentions in the Miniſtry of Sacraments. I lay firſt from the *caſe of Schiſm*; there have been many grievous Schiſmes in the Romiſh Church, notwithſtanding their vain pretence of Unity. *Onuphrius in Chronol. Pontific.* reckons out no leſs than thirty, one of which laſted from *Urban* the ſixth to the Council of *Conſtance*, no fewer than fifty years, if we believe *Onuphrius*. There have been two or three Popes at once; *Alter in alterum ſæviebat*, ſaith *Genebrard*: All this while *Bell.* confeſſes, *lib.* 4. *de Pontific. cap.* 14. that it was an hard matter to know which of them was the lawful Pope. Was all Chriſtian Faith gone from the Church becauſe of the uncertainty of this infallible Judge? 2. The ſame is more luculently confirmed from the *caſe of Simony*. It's acknowledged by Romaniſts, that Simony makes void the Election of a Pope, as is held out by *Gratian* in the Canon Law, *Cauſa* 1. *q.* 1. *cap.* 2. Now that there have been many Simoniacal intruſions into the Papal Chair, is as evident as that any in thoſe late times poſſeſſed it without Simony. Hence *Platina in vita Sylveſtri* 3. *eo tunc Pontificatus devenerat ut qui plus largitione valeret is tantummodo dignitatis gradum, bonis oppreſſis & rejectis obtineret, &c.* The Papacy in thoſe days was come to that paſs, that he who by Bribery could do moſt, alone obtained the dignity, good men being oppreſſed and rejected; which cuſtom, ſaith *Platina*, would to God our times did not ſtill retain: And *Spondanus*, *ad Annum* 1033. brings in *Glaber* thus complaining. *Hæ ſedes Apoſtolica*, Alaſs thou Apoſtolical See, which in the days of old was the glory of the world, art now, oh ſhame! become *Simonis officina*, the Shop and Forge of *Simon Magus*, and Hammers continually are beating on the Anvil to make helliſh coyn. You may have heard of *Genebrards* complaint, that in the ſpace of 150 years, from *John* 8. to *Leo* the 9. the Papal Chair was poſſeſſed with Apoſtatick Popes, who entered in *non per oſtium ſed per poſticam*, not by the Gate, but by the Poſtern. Once I thought upon the teſtimony of *Ciearella*, *in vita Sixti* 5. that *Sixtus* 5. had come to the Papal Chair with as much innocency from Simoniacal Penſation, as many of the late Popes; but now I find that his entry alſo was both Simoniacal and perfidious, whereof the Reader may receive a full account from *Henry Foulis* Hiſt. of Romiſh Treaſons, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 2. from which that Author concludes the nullity of the Elections of ſundry ſucceeding Popes, not only of *Urban* 7. *Greg.*

Greg. 14. and *Innocent* 9. but also of *Clement* 8. to all whose Elections did concur a multitude of Cardinals who had been created by *Sixtus* 5. a Simoniacal Pope, and consequently a *non habente potestatem.* Is any thing more evident from History than the Simoniacal intrusion of *Boniface* 8. *Alexander* 6. *&c.* Nay, seeing these Simoniacal transactions may be so secretly conveyed, that it is impossible to know who enters the Papacy without them; therefore it cannot be infallibly known who truly is Pope. The Simoniacal entry of *Sixtus Quintus*, probably had never been discovered, had not *Sixtus* violated his Simoniacal contract made with *Aloysius* a Cardinal *de Este*, which provoked the Cardinal to transmit the original contract subscribed by *Sixtus* own hand to *Philip* the Second King of *Spain*, who being lately disobliged by the Pope, threatned to accuse him of Simony in a Council at *Andalusia*; but the speedy death of *Sixtus* prevented the Process. 3. The same is yet further confirmed from the Popish Doctrine *of suspending the efficacy of Sacraments from the intention of the Ministers thereof*, according to the Decrees of the Councils of *Florence* in *Instruct. Armen.* and of *Trent*, *Sess.* 14. *cap.* 6. and from the Bull of *Leo* the tenth against *Luther*; therefore it's impossible to know infallibly if these who pass for Popes or Bishops, be Popes, Bishops, Priests, yea or baptized, consequently they cannot infallibly know whether any who were in the Council of *Trent* were capable to be constituent members of a Council. The evils of the Adversaries against this last instance were confuted, *cap.* 1.

Arg. 6. Both Pope and Council, who only are pretended to be this infallible Judge, may err in questions of Fact; therefore also in questions of Faith, the antecedent is confessed by Romanists themselves. Hence *Bell. lib.* 4. *de Pontif. cap.* 2. saith, *Conveniunt omnes Catholici posse Pontificem vel cum concilio generali errare in controversiis facti particularibus, quæ ex informatione testimoniisque hominum præcipue pendent*; that is, all Romanists agree, that not only the Pope as Pope, but also with a General Council may err in matters of Fact. If any will adopt that new notion of the Jesuits of *Clermont*, that the Pope is infallible, as to matters of Fact, he must first answer the arguments brought in the contrary by those of their own party, before I waste time in confuting so notorious a falshood; and the rather, seeing my Adversary yields, *pag.* 43. *that their infallible Judge may err in matters of fact.* The sequel is clear, seeing the decisions of many questions of Faith with them, have such dependance upon questions of Fact, that if the Judge err in the question of Fact, he

cannot

cannot but err in the queſtion of Faith. To prove this, I ſhall ſatisfie my ſelf with theſe two inſtances, *ad hominem*, againſt Romaniſts. Firſt, all Articles of Faith are not contained in Scripture according to them, but ſome are only to be fetched from Traditions. When therefore this viſible Judge is to determine a point not contained in Scripture, to be an Article of Faith, he can have no evidence thereof but from Tradition, nor of the Tradition, but by the teſtimonies of Hiſtories and Records of Antiquity, *&c.* Now is it not a meer matter of Fact, whether Records of Antiquity be genuine or corrupted? whether the relation of Hiſtorians be true or falſe? and therefore this viſible Judge may be deceived as to theſe, and conſequently concerning the Article of Faith, whoſe evidence depends thereupon. But leſt I ſhould ſeem only to argue upon a rarely contingent ſuppoſition, take a late example: When the Pope and Council of *Trent* defined the number of the Books of holy Scripture, and determined the Apocriphal Books to be Canonical, they had no ground to walk on but Tradition, and here undoubtedly their Errour, in matter of Fact, led them to an errour in matter of Faith; for theſe Apocriphal Books were never received by Univerſal Tradition, ſure not by *Melito*, *Juſtin Martyr*, *Athanaſius*, *Hierom*, the Council of *Laodicea*, yea, nor by *Greg.* 1. as D. *Coſins* hath fully demonſtrated in his Scholaſtical Hiſtory of the Canon of Scriptures. The other inſtance I give, is from the Canonization of Saints, wherein he proceeds meerly upon humane teſtimonies of the Sanctity and Miracles of ſuch a perſon, in which undoubtedly there may be deceit and falſhood, as *Cajetan* and ſother Romiſh Authors confeſs; which cannot but infer Errour, in point of Faith, among Romaniſts. Is it not a queſtion of Faith, whether ſuch a one as *Ignatius*, *Xavier*, *&c.* may be invocated as Saints? conſequently fallibility, in matter of Fact, cannot but infer fallibility in matter of Faith.

Arg. 7. Who ever pretend to be the infallible viſible Judge of controverſies of Faith, either have not Juriſdiction over the whole Catholick Church, or the Church may be without them; *ergo*, there is not a neceſſity of ſuch an infallible viſible Judge, as is deſcribed in the ſtate of the controverſie: The ſequel is evident, becauſe the aſſerting of the neceſſity of an infallible Judge, among other things, imports theſe two, as was ſhewed in ſtating of the controverſie. 1. A Juridical Authority over the whole Catholick Church. 2. That the Church can in no caſe want that Judge. If therefore that Judge have not Juriſdiction over the whole Church, or the Church may be

without him, there is no neceſſity of ſuch an infallible Judge as Romaniſts do contend for: The antecedent is eaſily proved, that a truly Oecumenick Council hath Juriſdiction over the whole Church is not denied, but it is clear, that the Church may be without *General Councils*. The firſt 300 years, from that Council of *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 15. until the *Nicene*, there was none, when the Church was ſo much toſſed with Perſecution and Hereſie. There have been long intervals betwixt General Councils; theſe divers hundred years really, there have been none: How much the Councils of *Conſtance*, *Baſil*, *Florence*, *Piſa*, and the *Lateran* under *Leo* the tenth, are queſtioned by Romaniſts themſelves, is ſufficiently known. Many Learned men, as *Gentilletus*, *Joachimus*, *Urſinus*, have demonſtrated that the Council of *Trent* was neither free, nor general, nor Orthodox. Since the *Trent* Conventicle, Papiſts themſelves pretend not to a General Council, nor is there probability in haſt of any; *ergo*, if a Council, or Pope and Council conjunctly be Judge, yet there is no neceſſity thereof, ſeeing the Church may be, and often hath been without that Judge: If it be ſaid that the Church never wants Oecumenick Councils when her neceſſity requires them, it is eaſily repelled, there were many controverſies of Faith to be decided in the firſt three Centuries concerning Rebaptization, the *Millennium*, *&c.* yet all that time there was no Oecumenick Council. Are there not many controverſies at preſent in the Roman Church betwixt Jeſuits and Janſeniſts, Dominicans and Jeſuits, Franciſcans and Dominicans? How many debates are among them concerning the ſenſe of many of the *Tridentine* Canons? Is there not need of one Oecumenick Council, if that could terminate the debates of Chriſtendom? If therefore the *definition of a living infallible Judge*, as oppoſed to a written inanimate rule, be neceſſary for the reſolution of Faith, then either God is wanting in providing for the neceſſities of his Church, which were Blaſphemy to aſſert, or an Oecumenick Council which very rarely ſits (yea ſome doubts if ever, at leaſt ſince that of *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 15. and therefore ſpare not to call it a Black Swan) cannot be that living Judge. As for the *Pope alone*, neither is he abſolutely neceſſary, nor hath he Juriſdiction over the whole Church. I ſay firſt he is not neceſſary, the Church may be without him, not only in the intervals betwixt the death of Popes, and the Election of their Succeſſors, ſometimes for two, ſometimes for ſeven years, but eſpecially in caſe of illegitimate intruders, of whom Hiſtory gives a large account; neither when they are, have they Juriſdiction

riſdiction over the whole Catholick Church. Let the Biſhops of *Rome* produce their Patent for ſuch an Univerſal Juriſdiction, and it ſhall be diſproved. Certainly the Ancient Church believed no ſuch thing: Had *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* believed this Supremacy and infallibility of the Pope, would thoſe holy Fathers ſo ſtedfaſtly withſtood the determination of the Pope in matter of Rebaptization: Had the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon* believed it, would they have given equal priviledges to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople?* Had *Auſtin* and the *African* Church believed it, would they have pronounced ſuch ſevere Decrees againſt them that appealed to *Rome?* Seeing then the Pope hath no Univerſal Juriſdiction, and both he and General Councils may be wanting, there is no neceſſity of them as the infallible viſible Judge, with power to paſs obligative ſentences on the whole Catholick Church; and beſide them, there is none who lay claim to ſuch a Prerogative.

Arg. 8. The Ancient Church acknowledged no infallible viſible Judge ſince the Apoſtolick Age; *ergo*, this Notion muſt be a novel invention of Romaniſts: The ſequel being clear, an Army of teſtimonies from Fathers might be brought to confirm the antecedent. For brevity ſake, let *Hierom* and *Auſtin* ſpeak for the reſt; *Hierom* in *Epiſt.* 62. *ad Theoph. Alex. Scio me aliter habere Apoſtolos, aliter reliquos tractatores, illos ſemper vera dicere, iſtos in quibuſdam ut homines errare*, I make a difference betwixt the Apoſtles and other Writers, thoſe always ſpake truth; but theſe in ſome things did err. *Auſtin* Epiſt. 112. *ad* Paulinum, *that which is confirmed by the Authority of holy Scripture, is without doubt to be believed*, aliis vero teſtibus vel teſtimoniis, *but for other witneſſes or teſtimonies, ye may receive or reject them as ye find they have more or leſs weight of reaſon.* Many more ſuch teſtimonies are brought by D. *Barron, Apod. Catbol. tract.* 5. *cap.* 18, and vindicated from the forged gloſſes of *Tanner, Gretſer*, and other Jeſuits: It's a piteous evaſion, *that thoſe Fathers do not only compare the Scripture with the writings of private Fathers, but not with the definitions of Popes and Councils*; for they expreſly oppoſe the Scriptures to all writings beſide the Canon of Scripture. *Auſtin* Epiſt. 19. *Solis Scripturarum libris didici hunc honorem deferre, ut nullum eorum ſcribendo erraſſe firmiſſime credam:* Yea, expreſly he compares Scriptures with Councils, *lib. ad Donat. poſt collat. cap.* 15. and *lib. de unit. Eccleſ. cap.* 18. and *cap.* 19. and *lib.* 2. *de bapt. contra Donat. cap.* 3. But not to inſiſt on that which is ſo copiouſly done by others, *Auſtin*'s opinion in this is ſo clear, that I only deſire you to

hear the confeſſion of *Occam*, *Part* 3. *Dial. tract.* 1. *lib.* 3. *cap* 24. *It is to be noted*, ſaith he, *that* Auſtin *ſpeaking of other Writers beſide the Pen-men of the Scripture, makes no difference of theſe Non-Canonical Writers, whether they be Popes, or others; whether they write in Council, or out of Council, the ſame judgment is to be paſſed on them.*

Arg. 9. If Popiſh Arguments be valid, why the Scriptures cannot be the ground of Faith, and terminate controverſies of Religion; then neither can the Sentences of Pope or Council, whether taken ſeparately or conjunctly: For they may be retorted with equal force upon the definitions of Popes and Councils, as ſhall, God willing, appear in the next Chapter.

It were eaſie to accumulate more arguments from Scripture, Reaſon, and Antiquity, againſt this abſurd poſition of Romaniſts, concerning the neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge; but, I hope, theſe may ſuffice; who deſiderate more, I remit them to *Whittaker*, *contr.* 3. *de concil. q.* 6. *contrv.* 4. *de Pontif. q.* 6. to *Rivet Iſagog. cap.* 20. to D. *Barron Apodex. cap. tract.* 5. *cap.* 5, 6. *&c.* to *Chillingworth cap.* 23. to the L. *Falkland* his Diſcourſe, together with *H. H.* Review of the Apology; to D. *Shirman* again, *F. Johnſon*, to D. *Stillingfleet*'s Rational Account of the grounds of the Proteſtant Religion, *Part.* 1. *cap.* 8. to M. *Pool*'s nullity of the Romiſh Faith, *cap.* 4. to *Tomb*'s Romaniſm diſcuſſed in Anſwer to *H. T.* his Manual of Controverſies, *Art.* 9. *&c.* As for the *arguments which the Pamphleter attributes to us, from pag.* 44. *to* 48. albeit he gives piteous Anſwers to divers of them, yet becauſe they are of his own framing, and he adheres not to the Arguments propounded by me againſt M. *Denſter*, I thought not fit to blot Paper at the time in canvaſing his Anſwers thereunto. Infallibility is a ſpecious notion; but under pretence of an infallible Judge, to draw Souls off from building their Faith upon the infallible Rule of holy Scripture, to reſt on the dictates of fallible and fallacious men, is to overturn the very Baſis of Chriſtian Religion, inſomuch that Reverend *Joſeph Hall*, in his *No Peace with* Rome, *Sect.* 5. on this very account aſſerts, *Reconciliation with* Rome *to be impoſſible.*

I ſhut up this part of the Debate with the confeſſion of M. *Ceſſy*, a late Apoſtate to Popery. *Exom l. cap.* 46. *Sect.* 3. where he acknowledges the unfortunateneſs of the word *Infallibility*, and profeſſes he could find no ſuch word in any Council, that no neceſſity appeared to him, that he, or any Proteſtant, ſhould ever have heard

that

that word named, much leſs preſſed with ſo much earneſtneſs, as of late it hath been generally in Diſputations, and in Books of Controverſies; and that M. *Chillingworth* combates this word with too much ſucceſs; and therefore he wiſhes that Proteſtants may never be invited to combate the Authority of the Church under that notion. I know M. *Creſſy* finding that the Jeſuited Party were offended at this freedom, made a kind of Retractation for this; but how diſingenuouſly and unfortunately, is ſhewed by D. *Tillotſon* in the Rule of Faith, *Part.* 2. *Sect.* 4. *pag.* 131.

SECT. III.

The Pamphleters Objections for the neceſſity of an Infallible viſible Judge, diſcuſſed.

IT now remains that I conſider what ſeems to be of any moment in the *Pamphleters Objections:* They may be reduced to two Heads. 1. *Scripture miſtaken.* 2. *Abuſed Authority of Fathers.* I ſhall take a little notice of both.

Firſt then from Scripture, in his *Sect.* 3. *pag.* 38. he ſcrapes together theſe teſtimonies, *Deut.* 17. 8. *Mat.* 18. 17. *Mat.* 16. 19. he ſhould have ſaid, *Mat.* 28. 20. 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. he ſhould have ſaid 15. the Pillar and ground of Truth: And to make his Progreſs ſeem compleat, *Was not* (ſaith he) *the Church Judge in Religion for the firſt two thouſand years, before any Scriptures were written.* To which I reply: 1. That the Pamphleter ſeems to have forgot his Theſis: Is he not to prove that there is an infallible viſible Judge? Ought he not then to make uſe of a *medium*, the Faith whereof doth not depend upon the teſtimony of this infallible Judge? Is not the Faith of the Scriptures, their Divine Original, the ſincerity of the Tranſlation, and ſenſe of the words, grounded, according to this Romaniſt, upon the teſtimony of the infallible Judge? What a jugling circulation then is this, to prove the infallibility of the Judge by Scripture; which, according to them, I cannot believe, till firſt I ſubſcribe to the infallibility of the Judge? How have *Becan, Greiſer, Turnbul, &c.* toiled to ſweating, to extricate themſelves, yet ſtill they remain ſhut up in a circle, believing the Scripture for the teſtimony of their infallible Judge, and the infallibility of the Judge for the Scriptures, as may appear by the arguing of this Circulator. But ſecondly, Doth not this miſerable Pamphleter cut the throat of his own cauſe?

For

For *pag.* 39. he aſſerts, *That the Supreme Judicatory, whoſe Infallibility is proved by thoſe Scriptures, is a General Council compoſed of all the Biſhops and Paſtors of the Church.* Now ſure it is, that there is no ſuch General Council in the Church at preſent, nor do Romaniſts alledge there hath been any theſe hundred years. How impertinently then were theſe Scriptures brought to prove the actual exiſtence of the infallible viſible Judge? or if the General Council be that Judge, then it evidently follows, that the Church may be without that Judge, elſe General Councils ſhould ſit without intermiſſion. Thirdly, The utmoſt that can be collected from theſe Scriptures is, that Councils have Judiciary Authority, that proper General Councils have Supreme Eccleſiaſtick Juriſdiction for deciſion of controverſies of Religion, and have peculiar promiſes of Divine Aſſiſtance for hitting on the right ſenſe of Scripture, eſpecially in things that are neceſſary to Salvation, providing they ſincerely uſe the means appointed by God, which Proteſtants do not deny. If this were all intended by theſe Scriptures, *non infertur elenchus:* For hence it does not follow, that Councils ſhall always be, or that the major part in General Councils ſhall ſincerely uſe the means appointed by God for finding out truth, or that in their deciſions they never ſhall deviate from truth, (far leſs that an Aſſembly of the Popes ſworn Vaſſals (ſuch as were thoſe that aſſembled at *Trent*) are a lawful General Council, or have either Juriſdiction over the whole Catholick Church, or infallibility in their deciſions. Let all the Jeſuits in *Europe* try if they can hammer out this concluſion out of any, or all thoſe Scriptures. Fourthly, Have not Learned Proteſtants a thouſand times vindicated thoſe Scriptures from the corrupt gloſſes of Romaniſts? Ought not this Pamphleter, had he intended to ſatisfie any judicious Reader, have confuted the exceptions of Proteſtants againſt their Popiſh gloſſes? But it ſeems our Miſſionaries do ſo brutifie the reaſon of their Proſelites, that they ſwallow down all their Dictates, how irrational ſoever, as infallible and unanſwerable Oracles. I will not trouble this Pamphleter to read large Volums, rifling of Pamphlets appears to have been his greateſt ſtudy, I ſhall only remit him to M. *Pool*'s ſhort, but judicious Tractate of the nullity of the Romiſh Faith, where he will find all thoſe Scriptures, and many more to this purpoſe, ſolidly vindicated: *Deut.* 17. 8. in his *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 12. *Mat.* 18. 17. in his *cap.* 4. *Sect.* 15. *Mat.* 16. 19. in his *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 7, 8, 9. *Mat.* 28. 20. in his *cap.* 4. *Sect.* 18. 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. in his *cap.* 4. *Sect.* 14. Yet fifthly, leſt I ſhould diſmiſs the

Reader

Reader with any diſſatisfaction, I will give a touch of all the particulars mentioned in the Objection.

I begin with *the* 2000 *years wherein he ſays the Church was Judge before the Scriptures were written.* But what then? is the caſe then and now alike? then the Church had no written Scripture. Does it therefore follow, that now it hath none either? Was the Church Judge in queſtions of Religion? *Quid hoc ad rhombum*, Is that the queſtion, whether the Church, that is, the Rulers or Paſtors convened in a Synod, have a Juridical power? is not the queſtion, whether theſe Repreſentatives be abſolutely infallible in their deciſions of Faith? is a Judicial Authority and Infallibility terms reciprocal? Would he pull down the Thrones of Princes, becauſe they arrogate not Infallibility? If he would have concluded any thing, he ſhould have ſaid, in the Church, in thoſe days, there was a ſtanding ordinary infallible viſible Judge, with Juriſdiction over the whole Church. If this he go about to prove, he will endeavour to derive the Pedigree of their Popes and Councils higher than I thought they pretended. I imagined *Peter* had been the firſt of the Series, but now, it's like, they will aſcend to *Adam:* I have lookt upon *Platina* and *Onuphrius* Catalogues of Popes, but there I find not the Catalogue of *Antediluvian* and *Anteſcriptural* Popes, from the Creation until *Moſes* time; which, if the Pamphleter look over his Chronologick Tables again, will be found to exceed 2000 *years.* In theſe times the Church had the ſame Doctrine, for ſubſtance, which now is written in the Scriptures, taught by Patriarchs and Prophets, and conveyed by Oral Tradition from Parents to Poſterity: But becauſe Tradition in it ſelf was not ſo ſafe a way for preſerving Religion in its purity, therefore the Lord was pleaſed to prorogate the lives of Patriarchs to many Centuries: *Adam* lived till *Methuſelah* was above 200 years old, *Methuſelah* lived till *Sem* was near an 100, and *Sem* out-lived *Abraham*: So that this Tradition needed not paſs through more than two hands, betwixt *Adam* and *Abraham*, for the ſpace of more than 2000 years; and withal he raiſed extraordinary Prophets, as *Enoch*, and others. Yet notwithſtanding all theſe extraordinary Adminicles, how ſoon was Religion corrupted, and the World over-ſpread with Idolatry and Polytheiſm? But laying aſide extraordinary Prophets, which the Lord then and in after-times raiſed up, it's more than all the combination of Jeſuits can prove, that in that interſtice of time, there was an ordinary ſtanding infallible viſible Judge with Juriſdiction over the whole Church; which if he

prove

prove not, he muſt let me tell him, *peccat ignorantiæ elenchi.*

I ſhut up my Reply to this branch of the Objection with two remarks: The firſt is, that Romaniſts do not agree among themſelves concerning their inferences from the ſtate of the Church before the writing of Scripture; M. *Serjeant*, and thoſe of the Traditionary way, do only conclude from it, that Oral Tradition is an infallible mean of conveying truth down to Poſterity. But the Jeſuited party, as appears by this Pamphleter, would conclude from it, the neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge: Their diſagreement in this, and other matters, are a ſhrewd preſumption that they neither have an infallible Judge, nor yet infallible Tradition. But ſecondly, Learned *Tillotſon* in his Rule of Faith, *Part.* 1. *Sect.* 4. acutely inverts this whole argument, for in that the Lord committed the Doctrine of Religion to writing, after that the World had experienced the unſucceſsfulneſs of the former way; it ſeems to be a good evidence, that this way by Scripture is the better and more ſecure: It being the way of Divine Diſpenſations, to proceed from that which is leſs perfect, to that which is more; and he conceives the Apoſtles reaſoning concerning the two Covenants, *Heb.* 8. 7. to be very applicable to theſe two methods of conveying Religion. If the firſt had been faultleſs, then ſhould no place have been ſought for the ſecond.

But perhaps he is happier in his next Allegation, from *Deut.* 17. 8. &c. *where there is a Judge in the Church of the Jews to be obeyed, in matters of Law and Religion, under pain of death.* Who ſees not how inconſequential the argument is from the Jewiſh Church to the Chriſtian? The Jewiſh High-Prieſts did marry, neither were any capable of the Prieſthood among them but the children of Prieſts: Will Romaniſts grant this parallel to hold in the Chriſtian Church? Though one man could be competent to govern an National Church, ſuch as the Jewiſh was, ſhut up in one little ſpot of the earth, doth it follow that one man is as capable of an Univerſal Monarchy over the Catholick Church diſperſed through the whole earth? Yet neither from this place can be proved the infallibility of the Jewiſh High-Prieſt or *Sanedrim*, elſe they ſhould have been infallible, not only in matters of Faith, but alſo of Fact: For there is expreſly mention made of queſtions of Fact, *v.* 8. between blood and blood, plea and plea, ſtroke and ſtroke, all which are to be decided by the teſtimonies of men; and in ſuch, Romaniſts acknowledge both Popes and Councils to be fallible. In that Commiſſion *Deut.* 17. 8, 9. the

Judge,

Judge, or Civil Magiſtrate, is joyned with the Prieſts, and the people are commanded equally to acquieſce in the ſentence of both, under pain of death. I ſuppoſe he will not, becauſe of this, grant infallibility to the Magiſtrate; how then can he inſer from it the infallibility of the Church Repreſentative? But were the Jewiſh High-Prieſts and *Sanedrim* infallible? I ſhall not ſtand to enquire how *Aaron* the High-Prieſt was ſtained with Idolatry, *Exod.* 33. 4, 5. how *Urish* the High Prieſt did make an idolatrous Altar, after the Altar of *Damaſcus*, 2 *King.* 16. 11. or what meant theſe general complaints, *Iſai.* 56. 10. *Jer.* 6. 13. *Jer.* 14. 14. *Hoſ.* 9. 8. *Ezek.* 22. 25, 26. *&c.* all which he will find vindicated from the exceptions of Romaniſts, by Learned *Whittaker*, *de Concil. q.* 6. *cap.* 3. I only enquire, whether the High-Prieſt and *Sanedrim* did err, when they condemned Chriſt as an Impoſtor and Blaſphemer? if they did, as none but Infidels can deny, then the Jewiſh *Sanedrim* was not infallible; only it may be asked, how did God command obedience to the *Sanedrim*, under pain of death, if they were not infallible? This Query might be anſwered by another: Do the Penal Statutes of Princes, under pain of death, prove them to be infallible? Was it not ſaid to *Joſhua*, *Whoſoever will not hearken to thee, let him be put to death?* But I anſwer abſolutely, that the active obedience to be given to the Jewiſh *Sanedrim*, was only *when they gave ſentence according to the Law.* This is clear from the Text, *v.* 9, 10. *Thou ſhalt obſerve to do according to all that they inform thee, according to the ſentence of the Law which they ſhall teach thee.* Learned *Rivet* in *Cathol. Orthod. tract.* 1. *q.* 8. obſerves the place to be thus ſenſed by famous Authors in the Romiſh Church; by *Cajetan*, the Author of the *Gloſſa Ordinaria*, *Lyranus*, and *Hieron Oleaſtrius*; and that *Lyranus* from the reſtriction, according to the Law, refutes that abſurd gloſs of the Jewiſh Rabbins, that if the Judge ſhould ſay that the right hand were the left, and the left hand the right, *talis ſententia eſt tenenda*; like to which is that forecited ſaying of *Bell. lib.* 4. *de Pontif. cap.* 5. If the Pope command Vice, and prohibit Vertue, the Church were bound to believe Vice to be good, and Vertue evil: But we have not ſo learned Chriſt; the Judge was to give ſentence according to the Law, or as *Ezek.* 44. 24. *According to the Judgments of the Lord.* I am not ignorant of the *ordinary Cavil of Romaniſts, that then the people were to judge of the ſentence of the* Sanedrim, *whether it were according to the Law.* I diſtinguiſh: They were to judge of the ſentence of the *Sanedrim* by an Authoritative Judg-

ment; it does not follow, by a judgment of discretion, in order to their own practise, I grant. This Romanists cannot deny, unless they would devest the people of Reason, and turn them into Bruits. When Romish Missionaries labour to Proselite people to the Romish perswasion, do they not labour to convince them, that it's more rational to believe their Church, than to adhere to the Religion of Protestants? Is not this to grant them a judgment of discretion? How then can they condemn us for that which themselves allow? Excellently said *Clemens Alex. Stromat. lib.* 7. Διακρίτεον τῇ κατὰ λῃπτίκῃ θεωρίᾳ καὶ τωκυριωτατῷ λόγισμῳ τὸ ἀληθὲς ἀπὸ τοῦ φαίνομενου. I confess the Learned *Grotius* in *loc.* will not have these words, *according to the Law*, to be restrictive; yet he denies that from the place the infallibility of the *Sanedrim* can be concluded, the scope of the Statute being not to enjoyn all to believe what the *Sanedrim* did Decree, but only *non contra agere, non contra docere*; not to act or teach contrary to the sentence of the *Sanedrim*. How warrantably he thus glosses, is not my concern now to examine, only it overturns the notion of infallibility.

But *are we not commanded to hear the Church? Mat.* 18. 17. Yes. But does it therefore follow that the Church, that is, her Pastors assembled in a General Council, cannot err in matters of Faith? who would not smile at such an inference? Are we not also commanded, to hear not only the Catholick Church in her Oecumenick Councils, but also in National or Provincial Assemblies; yea, and particular Pastors, *Luke* 10. 17. *He that heareth you, heareth me:* Yet Romanists, I hope, will not thence conclude either Provincial or National Assemblies, let be particular Pastors, infallible. Can any Romanist prove that the Church, *Mat.* 18. 17. is only taken for a Pope, or General Council? Is there a Text in all the Bible where the Church signifies the Pope of *Rome*? I appeal all the Order of Jesuits to instance it if they can. Doth not the word *Church*, in this Scripture, comprehend all those Churches which *cognosce* of offences? if therefore that Scripture furnish one argument for infallibility, then the particular Churches of *Scotland* and *England* might claim infallibility as well as *Rome*: Is it not evident from that context, *Mat.* 18. 17. that there we are commanded to hear and obey the Church in her Censures; and yet Romanists cannot deny, but in her Censures she may err, and proceed *clave errante*, because in her decisions of that kind, she depends on humane testimony. See *Lombard lib.* 4. *sent. dist.* 18. it's manifest therefore nothing can be concluded thence

as

as to infallibility. But how then are we commanded to hear the Church? *Answ.* In so far as she adheres to her Commission, the Rule of Gods Word, and thus she cannot deceive us: if she or an Angel from Heaven go beyond that Rule, they are not to be heard, *Gal.* 1. 8. Yet lastly, Giving, and not granting, that a General Council could not err, what's that to the Pope and his Schismatical Conventicles, which have no more of a General Council, *præter nomen inane.*

But *Matth.* 16. 18. *The Gates of Hell cannot prevail against the Church?* I ask what Church, if the invisible of the Elect, then it touches not the question in hand, concerning a visible Judge; if the Catholick visible Church in her diffusive capacity, then it's yet from the purpose, for as such she exercises no Juridical Power; if the Catholick visible in her Representatives, then he might as well conclude her impeccability as her inerrability, for the Devil prevails over Souls by sins of practise, as well as by errours in judgment. But it's confessed by all, that impeccability of Councils cannot be concluded, therefore neither inerrability. I must remember him that his Fellow Jesuit *Tirin*, as cited by *Maresius*, *controv.* 5. *num.* 3. says it's uncertain, whether the κατ' ἀν, against which should be construed with the Rock, or with the Church; if it relate to the Rock, then the words only affirm, that the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Rock upon which the Church is built; which as *Austin*, and many other Fathers expound, is Christ himself, yet granting that it were here said, that the Gates of Hell should not prevail against the Church, how can it be proved, that when the Pope, or the major part of a General Council is smitten with a lesser Doctrinal errour, that the Gates of Hell prevails against the Church? Hath he not heard the distinction, that albeit in such a case the Gates of Hell *valent*, yet *non prevalent*, they hurt the Church, but do not wholly overthrow the Church. To conclude, all that I suppose can be inferred from that Scripture is, that the whole Catholick visible Church shall not err in Fundamentals. Indeed if the whole diffusive did err in Fundamentals, the Gates of Hell should prevail, then the Church should be extinguished. But to prove the inerrability of the Pope and his Council from this Scripture, the Pamphleter may improve all the assistance *Rome* can give him in his next Reply.

But *hath not Christ promised to his Church*, Mat. 28. 20. *Lo, I am with you to the end of the world? Answ.* If every one be infallible who have a promise that God will be with them, then every Belie-

ver may claim infallibility because of the promise, *Joh.* 14. 23. Is the presence and assistance of Christ with every one in the same measure and degree wherein it was to be with the Apostles? Is not the promise of the presence of Christ *Mat.* 28. 20. conditional? Doth he not say, *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you*; and then, *Loe* (in so doing) *I am with you to the end of the world.* Hath not then the Church of *Rome* forfeited her Claim to this Promise, by enjoyning many things directly contrary to the Command of Jesus Christ, such as the Communion under one kind, worshipping Images, invocating Saints, &c.

Lastly remains that place 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *Where the Church is call'd the Pillar and Ground of Truth*; to which, on all occasions, they flee as the chief support of their infallibility, but in vain. For first, were I disposed to Criticise, I might remember him that their own *Estius* on the place observes, that the Greek word στυλὸς, signifies not only a Pillar, but also a writing Pensil; so as the Church may be termed, *Stylus veritatis*, or the Pensil of Truth, because by her the Lord writes in the hearts of men the Doctrines of Truth, which may be done by the Ministry of the Word, though she have no infallible visible Judge. I might likewise advertise him, that *Heinsius*, as is noted by M. *Leigh* in his *Critica Sacra*, affirms that στυλος also signifies a Station or place wherein a person doth stand or sit; and that the other word ἑδραίωμα, coming from ἕδρα, a Seat may be much of the same importance, and then the sense will be, the Church is the Seat of Divine Truth: So as all truths necessary to Salvation, are always to be found in her, and in no other Society. Yet hence it no more follows that in her is a visible Judge exempted from all Doctrinal Errour, than because she is the Seat of true Holiness, it can be concluded that there is in her a Judge exempted from all sin. Perhaps secondly, the Adversary will have difficulty to disprove them (among whom is the Learned *Camero* in *Myroth*) who joyn these words, *The Pillar and Ground of Truth not with the Church, but with that which follows*; and so the meaning will be, that the great Mystery of Godliness, mentioned *vers.* 16. is the Pillar and ground of Truth, that is a chief Article of Faith and Religion, as the Jews term the points of their Religion, *Fundamenta & Radices.* Hence that famed Rabbin *Maimonides*, as *Camero* observes, begins his Book, *Fundamentum Fundamentorum & columna sapientiæ est cognoscere esse primum ens, &c.* Does it not appear a little harsh (to use the arguings of *Marcf. controv.* 5. *cont. Tirin num.* 3.)

that

that the Church be called the House of God, and also a Pillar in one sentence? A House may have Pillars, but the House and the Pillar are not the same. Seems it not probable, that the Apostle having described the Church, as the House of God, should then point at these Foundation-Truths, which he enumerates in v. 16. as the Pillar which supports the House? Some, I confess, of our own Divines seem not so well pleased with that construction of *Camero*, among whom are *Gul. Rivet*, Son to the Famous *Andreas Rivetus*, and *Ravanel*. But with Reverence to these Learned men, I must crave leave to say, their Arguments against it seem at best but topical. Thirdly, May not *Chillingworth's* notion, *Part.* 1. *cap.* 3. *Sect.* 76. have it's probability, who by the Pillar and ground of Truth, understands not the Church, but *Timothy*; and so there is an ellepsis of the Particle ὰς or ὰν; which is frequent in Scripture, as if it were ὰς στυλος, ὰν στυλος, and the meaning will be, that thou mightest behave thy self in the Church, which is the House of God, as a Pillar. And thus not only Apostles, as *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, *Gal.* 2. 9. but also faithful zealous Ministers may be termed Pillars. *Nazianzen* gives the like Titles *Orat.* 19. to *Basil*, and *Orat.* 21. to *Athanasius*. So *Basil Epist.* 62. honours the Bishop of *Neo-Cesarea* with this very Title of στυλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας; therefore either *Nazianzen* and *Basil* judged all these persons infallible, which I suppose none will affirm, or if they did not, then they did not think these words to import infallibility. But fourthly, Granting it be said of the Church, yet it makes nothing for the Romish Interest, many probably supposing that to be spoken of the particular *Ephesine* Church: Now particular Churches by the acknowledgment of all may err. If it should be extended to the Catholick Church, what is that to the Roman, she being at the best but a particular Church? But whether universal or particular Church be here meant, yet if it be not the Church Representative, it makes nothing to the purpose in hand concerning the visible Judge. But the very Series of the context seem to favour them who understand the place rather of the Church governed, than governing, that thou (says he to *Timothy*) mightest know how thou ought to behave thy self in the House of God, which is the Church; that is, how *Timothy* as a Pastor should carry among those under his charge. Was not the Church in the first 300 years the Pillar and ground of Truth, as well as now? yet all that time after the first Council at *Jerusalem*, she never assembled in a General Council; *ergo*, her being Pillar and ground

ground of Truth is not by Conciliary infallibility. But fifthly, Giving, and not granting, that it were spoken of the Representative of the Catholick Church, yet infallibility will never be infallibly deduced from it: Why may not she be called the Pillar and ground of Truth in a politick sense, because Ministerially she holds forth the Truth; as a Programme, affixed to a Pillar is exposed to publick view of others, but not in an Architectonick sense, as if the Church did Authoritatively and infallibly support the Truth; especially seeing, as *Ireneus* saith, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 11. *columna & firmamentum Ecclesiæ est Evangelium.* The written Gospel (for of that he there speaks) is the ground and Pillar of the Church; yea, and *Hierom*, as cited by a *Lapide* on the place, writeth thus; *Ecclesia est columna & firmamentum veritatis, quia in ea sola stat veritas firmata, quæ sola sustinet ædificium Ecclesiæ.* If the truth alone, as *Hierom* says, doth sustain the Church, then doth not the Church in an Architectonick sense sustain the Truth: yet do we not deny but the Church is a Keeper, Witness, Propounder, and Defender of the Truth. Why may not this phrase, the Church is the Pillar and ground of Truth, hold forth the Churches duty, what, *de jure*, she ought to do, and not what always, *de facto*, is her practise infallibly? Though *Rom.* 13. 3. it be said, that Rulers are not a terrour to good works, but to evil; yet the Romanists will not grant, that Magistrates do always and infallibly countenance Godliness and Truth, because there he speaks what's their duty, not what always is their practise. Why may not the Church be called a Pillar, in regard of solidity, though not in regard of infallibility, to signifie the difficulty of her removal from truth, though not the impossibility? But sixthly, as *Chillingworth loc. cit. Sect.* 78. does further acutely observe concerning this Scripture; though it were granted that the Church were called the Pillar and ground of Truth, not only because she ought, but also because she always shall hold forth the Truth, yet Romanists lose their design, unless they could prove that she shall hold forth all truth without any failure. That in the Catholick Church all Truths, necessary to Salvation, shall be preserved, is acknowledged by Protestants; but Romanists have to prove, that the Representatives of the Catholick Church cannot err concerning any Doctrinal point, which they will hardly evict from this place, in which the Note of Universality is wanting, however the Church be said to be the Pillar and ground of Truth, yet not of all Truth. Seventhly and lastly, Granting that infallibility were truly predicated of the Apostolick

lick Church, in that time when the Apoſtle wrote, does it therefore follow, *ergo*, ſhe is now infallible. It's confeſſed, that then there was an infallible viſible Judge in the Church, endowed with the gift of Tongues and Miracles, the caſe of the Church ſo requiring, for founding the Goſpel Church, and compleating the Canon of holy Scripture; but it doth not follow, that it ſhall be ſo in every Age, neither do the neceſſities of the Church require it. Thus I have gone through all the Scriptures alledged by this Pamphleter for his infallibility: whether they prove his Theſis, let them who are not willing to be deceived, judge.

The Pamphleters ſecond Objection contains a *Farraga* of abuſed *Teſtimonies of Antiquity*. *Pag.* 39, 40, 41. To amuſe the ignorant Reader, he hath gathered up from their Manuals, Pamphlets, and Controverſie Books, a heap of impertinent teſtimonies of *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Coryſoſtom*, both the *Cyrils*, *Ambroſe*, *Euſebius*, and *Auſtin*; aſſerting, that the Church ſhall not fail, or be adulterated with Hereſie.

To all which I anſwer: Firſt, that none of theſe contain the ſentence of an infallible, viſible, or living Judge, they are but broken ſhreds out of the writings of Doctors long ago dead; and ſo, according to his own Principles, are not a ſufficient ground of Faith to ſuch a myſterious point as he contends for. I anſwer ſecondly, that ſome of theſe are groſly miſ cited, particularly the firſt from *Irenæus*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 49. whereas in all that *lib.* 1. of *Irenæus*, there be but 35 *cap.* Neither ſeems this to be a meer eſcape of the Printer, for it's again cited the ſame way, *pag.* 102. But I muſt excuſe him, for *H. T.* in his Manual of Controverſies, *Art.* 5. (from whom he ſeems implicitly to have taken this and many more of his teſtimonies) miſ-cites the ſame teſtimony of *Irenæus* after the ſame manner, for which he is juſtly chaſtiſed by M. *Tombs* in his Romaniſm diſcuſſed, *Art.* 5. *Sect.* 6. They are ſurely to be pitied who ſee with other mens eyes: But by the words of the teſtimony, I perceive he ſhould have cited *lib.* 4. *cap.* 43. He is no whit happier in his next citation from *Irenæus*, *cap.* 62. where he mentions the *cap.* but not the Book, following there alſo his Guide *H. T. loc. cit.* but by the words, I likewiſe ſuſpect, it ſhould have been *lib.* 4. *cap.* 62. But thirdly, I anſwer, that in none of all theſe teſtimonies cited by him, is there any mention of the Roman Church, of the Pope of *Rome*, or of Councils ſwearing ſubjection to him, but of the Catholick Church in general; ſo that whatever be of theſe teſtimonies,

ſtimonies, they make nothing for the Papal intereſt; yet, as if all that is ſaid of the Catholick Church ſhould be expounded of the Romiſh Church, here he takes occaſion to ſnarl with a Cynical ſpite at me, becauſe in my *Paper* 3. againſt Jeſuit *Demſter*, I had made mention of an eminent perſon, who conſidering the ſuſperciliouſneſs of the Biſhop of *Rome*, did break forth into theſe words, *Odi faſtum iſtius Eccleſiæ.* Now I only ask, whether he will deal at this rate with *Baſil* the Great, who *Epiſt.* 10 hath a ſharp reflection upon τῆς δυτικῆς ὑβρεως, the pride of the Weſtern or Romiſh Church. But fourthly, not to triſle time in a particular examination of theſe teſtimonies, which have been ſo often canvaſed by our Controverſie-Writers, and divers of them lately by *M. Tombs*, *loc. cit.* as *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, to which the reſt ſeem on the matter homogeneous (except it be that of *Auſtin*, *Epiſt.* 118. which ſpeaks of the power of the Church, in reference to things indifferent, and ſo concerns not the matter in hand) I anſwer to them all in *cumulo*, that they are wholly impertinent to the preſent Debate, for none of them ſpeak of an infallible viſible Judge; far leſs aſſert the neceſſity thereof, ſome of them ſpeak of the perpetuity and indefectibility of the Church, that ſhe cannot be overthrown, and ceaſe to be, as *Ambroſe*, *Chryſ ſt. Euſebius*; the reſt hold forth, that there is a *depoſitum* of truth intruſted to the Church: So that their utmoſt ſignificancy, is to teſtifie that God will preſerve in his Church Divine Truths, which are neceſſary to Salvation, and that the whole Catholick Church ſhall never be adulterated with Hereſie, or periſh, which Proteſtants do freely grant. And ſo none of theſe teſtimonies do touch the queſtion in hand; for the queſtion is not, whether the whole Catholick Church may forſake truths neceſſary to Salvation, but whether there ſhall always be a viſible Judge with Juriſdiction over the whole Catholick Church, who cannot err in the leaſt Doctrinal deciſion, of which there is nothing in any of theſe teſtimonies. This is ſo evidently the meaning of them, that the Pamphleter did foreſee, *pag.* 41. *it would be replied to him, that they were to be underſtood of the Church in its diffuſive capacity*; and thereupon, without once attempting to prove that they were otherwiſe to be taken, he proceeds *pag.* 42. and 43. to another *heap of Teſtimonies*, which he emendicates, for moſt part, from *Bell. lib.* 2. *de concil. cap.* 3. and they ſeem indeed to ſpeak of the Repreſentatives of the Church, and ſo appear to come nearer to the caſe in hand. But before I come to examine them, I muſt, in the fifth place, re-

tort the Pamphleters Argument from this first heap of testimonies against the Romish Church, thus; the true Catholick Church is never adulterated with Heresie, nor does depart from the great Truths once delivered to the Saints, say these testimonies of Fathers; but the Romish Church hath departed manifestly from the Ancient Faith delivered to the Saints, as appears by her gross Innovations, such as her Doctrine of Transubstantiation, Half Communion, Invocation, and Worshipping of Saints deceased, and Angels, Relicks, Images, Crosses, performing the worship of God in an unknown Tongue, and the rest of her Errours and abuses, manifestly repugnant to Scriptures, and the Faith of the Primitive Church, as hereafter may be particularly cleared; *ergo*, the Roman is not the true Catholick Church, consequently these testimonies are so far from advantaging him, that they cut the throat of his own Cause.

His next bundle of testimonies, *pag.* 42,43. do indeed speak of Councils, but make nothing for the necessity of an infallible visible Judge, as is largely demonstrated by *Whittaker, de concil. q. 6. cap. 2. Davenant de Jud. controv. cap. 19.* and *Spalat. lib. 7. de Repub. Eccles. cap. 3.* I shall give but a few brief Animadversions concerning them. And first, this bundle of testimonies speaks only of Councils, and consequently not of an infallible visible Judge, without which the Church cannot subsist, there having been whole Ages without General Councils. Secondly, I shall not stand now to accuse the Pamphleter of mis-citations, though the testimony which he ascribes to *Basil* is not to be found in *Epist.* 10. nor that he gives to Pope *Leo* in *Epist.* 64. And though there be not a tenth Book of *Cyril de Trinitate*, unless it be meant of his other work entituled *Thesaurus*, it either *Possevin* in *apparatu*, or *Bell. de Scriptoribus Eccles.* give a right account of his works, Yea, the whole Treatise *de Trin.* is concluded suppositititious by *Bell. de Script. Eccles.* yet I confess *Bell. lib. 9. de concil. cap. 3.* would be making use of the same testimony from *Cyril*, (for it is usual with the Cardinal to make a Muster of Testimonies, which himself knew to be spurious) but he cites it not as this Pamphleter, from *lib.* 10. but from *lib.* 1. *de Trin.* All I say of such escapes is, that he would take better heed the next time that he transcribes his citations, from *Bellarmine*: But I cannot let him pass with another more egregious prevarication; for what *Leo*, *Epiphanius*, *Athanasius*, *Basil*, and *Cyril* spake particularly of the Decrees of the *Nicene* and *Chalcedon* Councils against *Nestorians*, *Arrians*, and *Eutychians*, the Pamphleter cites as spoken of all Councils. We

grant the first four General Councils of *Nice*, *Constantinople*, *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*, did *de facto* define faithfully, according to the Scriptures; but doth it therefore follow, that all Councils shall not only do so, but also that they cannot do otherwise, or are infallible? Thirdly, It's true that *Greg. lib. 1. Epist. 24.* says, *he honours the first four General Councils, as he does the four Evangelists*: But it's as true he says also, he honours likewise the fifth General Council, which condemned Pope *Vigilius* as an Heretick: if therefore *Gregories* Authority be Authentick, the Jesuited party is deceived, who make the Papal Chair the Seat of infallibility. He might also have remembred, that *Bell. lib. 2. de concil. cap. 12.* confesses, that the forecited testimony of *Greg.* hath need of a qualification; and therefore says that *Gregories sicut*, is a note of similitude, not of equality; otherwise the Cardinal cannot deny, but *Greg.* over reached. By this still the impertinency of the citation is obvious, for it amounts to this, *Greg.* said the first four General Councils defined Orthodoxly; *ergo*, all Councils are infallible. Such is the ludibrious inconsequence of what he objects, *concerning the esteem which* Constantine *had of the Nicene Council.* Is this the question betwixt us and Romanists, whether the Decrees of the Nicene Council against *Arius* were Orthodox? Fourthly, *Austin* indeed, *Epist. 162. calls the Sentence of an Oecumenick Council, the last Sentence that can be expected on Earth.* But how inconsequent is it from thence to inferre the infallibility of Councils? Is every Supreme Court infallible? Fifthly, He cites *Vincentius Lyrin Commonit. cap. 4.* (I suppose he should have said *cap. 41.*) *saying, all are to be accounted Hereticks, who do not conform themselves to the Decrees of Oecumenick Councils.* It were enough to referre him to D. *Barrons Apod. Cathol. tract. 5. cap. 18.* where at length is demonstrated, that *Vincentius* maintained not the infallibility of Councils: Nay, *Vincentius cap. 3.* proposes two means for avoiding Heresie; the one, and the principal, is the Authority of the Sacred Scriptures; the other (which we never disclaimed in its own place) is the universal and perpetual Tradition of the Catholick Church; namely, *quod ab omnibus, ubique, & semper est creditum.* What he speaks *cap. 41.* of conformity with Councils, is not for the decision of all controversies, as himself declares, nor is it by the sentence of a present living Judge, but of Ancient Councils, and that in so far, as they hold out what hath been the Universal Tradition of the Church: And therefore when they are found incompetent for decision of controversies, *Recurren-*

dum

dum (ſaith he) *ad Sanctorum Patrum ſententias*; to the unanimous ſuffrage of Fathers, which is far from the Tenet of the Pamphleter, concerning a preſent living infallible Judge. And though *Vincentius* doth magnifie Univerſal Tradition, yet it is without derogation from the holy Scriptures; and therefore he ſaith in that place, *cap.* 42. *Non quia Canon ſibi ſolus ad univerſa non ſufficiat*, not that the Canon of Scripture is not of it ſelf alone ſufficient for all things, but only in a ſecondary room, as being explicative of the holy Scriptures. Sixthly, He brings *Auſtin lib.* 1. *de bapt. cont. Don. cap.* 7. *affirming, that no doubt ought to be made of what is eſtabliſhed by full Decree of a Council:* But *Auſtin* affirms no ſuch thing, all that *Auſtin* ſays is, that there have been various Decrees concetning Rebaptizing in Provincial Councils, *Donec plenario totius orbis concilio quod ſaluberrime ſentiebatur, etiam remotis dubitationibus firmaretur*; which imports no more, but that by the Decrees of an Oecumenick Council, truth may be ſo cleared, as to remove all grounds of doubting: But it doth not follow, becauſe a Council may clearly define truth, that therefore every Council ſhall infallibly define ſo: Nay, on the contrary, *Auſtin* in the ſame *cap.* holds all definitions beſide Scripture to be but humane, *Ne videar* (ſaith he) *humanis agere argumentis——ex Evangelio profero certa documenta*; *i. e.* leſt I ſhould ſeem to deal with humane arguments,—— I bring certain evidences from the Goſpel; and *lib.* 2. *cap.* 3. he affirms, that ſubſequent General Councils may correct the Decrees of former Plenary Councils, and that in matters of Faith, as I ſhew before; and therefore he ſuppoſes that General Councils themſelves are fallible. Seventhly, That trivial argument which he uſes, *That the Fathers were wont to ſubſcribe the Canons of General Councils, and annexed* Anathema's *againſt thoſe who did oppoſe them*, concludes no more for the infallibility of General Councils, then of Provincial Synods, the ſame alſo being done in them, yea in Heretical Councils alſo: it therefore only imports, that they who pronounced *Anathema*'s, believed that *hic & nunc*, they had defined truly, but not that they judged all Councils, in all their deciſions infallible.

That teſtimony of *Auſtin*'s, *contra Epiſt. fundi cap* 5. ſo oft objected by Romaniſts, is alſo inſiſted upon by this Pamphleter; *Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, niſi me Eccleſiæ commoveret Authoritas*; Knew not this Pamphleter how oft this teſtimony hath been canvaſed by Proteſtants? Ought he not therefore to have let it alone, or then to have confuted what they have ſaid for cutting off Romiſh

inferences from it? I shall say but these few things thereof; And 1. It might be enough, as to the present controversie, to tell that *Austin* does not say, except the Authority of a present infallible visible Judge did move me. 2. It savours of deceit, that the Pamphleter has left out the word *Catholicæ*; it's the Catholick Church *Austin* speaks of, not the *Roman*. But I must in part excuse the Pamphleter, for he found it also so mutilated in *H. T's Manual loc. cit.* 5. Have not Popish Authors put considerable glosses on *Austin's* words, which enervate sufficiently all inferences concerning the necessity of an infallible visible Judge? Whether they be expounded with *Gerson*, of the Apostolick Church, *Eorum qui Christum viderunt & audiverunt*, or with *Occam*, of the Universal diffusive Church: Sure they make nothing for an infallible visible Judge. But fourthly, *Melchior Canus*, *lib.* 2. *loc. com. cap.* 8. seems to have hit on the right meaning of *Austin*, *viz.* that he speaks not of the formal object into which his belief was resolved, or of the Primary Rule of Faith, but only of a motive, which when he was a *Manichean*, first induced him to credit the Scriptures; and so, according to the *African* Dialect, he uses the *imperfect tense* for the *preterit*, *commoveret* for *commovisset*, which *Rivet* in *Isagog. cap.* 3. confirms by many parrallel phrases out of *Austin*. And thus the testimony of the Church has but a place among the motives of credibility, which Protestants do not deny. This is the more probable, because *Austin tract.* 15. in *Joh.* compares the testimony of the Church to the testimony of the Woman of *Samaria*: But sure it is, her testimony was but an introductive mean to the Faith of her Fellow-Citizens, not the formal object, or principal ground thereof. Hence, said they, *Joh.* 4. 42. *Now we believe not for thy Saying, but because we have heard him our selves.* 5. Not to add more, Learned *Calovius de Author. Script. Sect.* 36. hath observed a various Lection in that place of *Austin*, that an old Copy, printed at *Basil* by the care of *John Amberbachius*, reads it thus: *Nisi Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Auctoritas me commoneret.* It was very easie for inadvertent Scribes to turn *n* to *v*: And this reading does yet further confirm that Exposition of *Rivet*, *Melchior Canus*, and others, as if the testimony of the Church were *Commonitorium quoddam, non principium fidei*, a certain Commonitory, not the principle or ultimate ground of Faith. What is said of this place, may also sufficiently vindicate that other parallel testimony of *Austins* in that same Book, *cap.* 4. where there be three things which confirm the Exposition given; one is, that *Austin* uses the *præter-perfect*

fell time, *Quia per eos illi credideram*, another is, *Si forte in Evangelio aliquid apertissimum de Manichæi Apostolatu invenire potueris*; where he supposes that the Gospel speaks clearly, without the interposition of the sentence of an infallible Judge. And thirdly, He clearly holds forth that the Church, of whose Authority he there speaks, is not to be restricted to any visible Judge, but to be extended to the Body of sound Christians; and therefore calls it *Catholicorum Authoritatem*. This is yet further evident from *cap.* 3. that he dreamed not of any infallible Authority in the present Church, for there he gives an account of his being in the Catholick Church, *from the consent of People and Nations, from that Authority which was begun by Miracles, nourished by Hope, encreased by Charity, and confirmed by continuance.* Sure then he resolved not his Faith into the infallible testimony of the present Church. By this time, I hope it appears, that all the Pamphleter hath brought for the necessity of his infallible visible Judge, are either false citations, or meer Paralogisms.

To shut therefore up this discourse, I cannot but notice that ordinary Cheat of Romanists, when ever they find any high Elogies of the *Catholick Church*; these they appropriate to their Roman, that is, to their infallible visible Judge, who, in the sense of the Jesuited party, is the *Pope:* However, to decline the *odium*, they seem to talk of a Council. An instance of this we have in a testimony which the Pamphleter cites, *pag.* 37. for his infallible visible Judge from *Austin*, *Serm.* 14. *de verbis Ap.* where indeed *Austin* makes honourable mention of the Catholick Church, but hath not one word through all that Sermon of the Roman, or of an infallible visible Judge, yea in it he disputes against the *Pelagians* acutely from Scripture; and therefore concludes, *cap.* 16. *proinde nemo nos fallat, Scriptura evidens est, Authoritas fundatissima est, fides Catholicissima est*, in *cap.* 13. In prosecution of a Scriptural Argument, he draws a confirmation, *a consuetudine Ecclesiæ* from the custom and practise of the Universal Church in her Rituals of Baptism, holding Infants for Believers, and not from any definition of a visible Judge, and thereupon gives these Elogies to the Church, *cap.* 14. 18. 21. which surely must be understood of that Church, from which he took the confirmation of his argument against the *Pelagians*; but that was not from the Roman Church, nor from the sentence of an infallible visible Judge, but from the practise of the Catholick, and that founded in Scripture. Hence those two go together in him, *Hoc habet*

bet Authoritas matris Eccleſiæ, hoc fundatus veritatis obtinet Canon. What, I pray, is that eſtabliſhed Canon of Truth, but the Holy Scripture? I acknowledge *Auſtin* juſtly condemns them, *cap.* 16. *who endeavour* quatere fundamentum Eccleſiæ, *to ſhake the Foundation of the Church:* Let them be held for Hereticks that ſhake the Foundation of the Church, whether Papiſts or Proteſtants. Two Foundations I find in holy Writ; one is Chriſt Jeſus, according to that of the Prophet *Iſai.* 28. 16. *Behold I lay in* Zion *a Foundation, a Stone, a tryed Stone, a precious Corner ſtone, a ſure Foundation*; which is luculently expounded of Chriſt, 1 *Pet.* 2. 4, 5, 6, 7. Doth not *Bell.* ſhake this Foundation, when he is bold *Præfat. ad lib. de Pontif.* to expound that Divine Oracle of the Pope of *Rome*, as if he were the Foundation of the Catholick Church? *O execrable Blaſphemy!* Again, the holy Scriptures are mentioned as a Foundation of the Church: Hence is that *Epheſ.* 2. 20. *Built upon the Foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief Corner-ſtone*; that is, on the holy Scriptures written by them. Did not Jeſuit *Baylie* ſnake this Foundation, when he was not afraid to ſay, *that there is no more Faith to be given to Scripture, than to* Titus Livius, *were it not for the teſtimony of their Romiſh Church.* Let never my Soul come into the ſecrets of theſe *Blaſphemers*: Romaniſts are ſtill prating of the Authority of the Catholick Church; but who do ſo much infringe the Authority of the Catholick Church as they? Should the City of *Edinburgh* arrogate the Legiſlative Power over all the Shires and Cities of this Kingdom, would it not overturn the Authority of the Kingdom of *Scotland*, when the Roman Church, which at her beſt was but a member of the Catholick, does now uſurp Juriſdiction over the whole, and imperiouſly would obtrude Heretical Doctrines, and Idolatrous Superſtitions, by a pretended Infallible Authority; is not this to overturn the Authority of the Catholick Church? And therefore I know none who may fear that threatning of *Auſtin* more than the Court of *Rome*, *Contra hunc inexpugnabilem murum quiſquis arietat, Confringetur.*

CAP.

CAP. III.

That the Scriptures are the Principal, Compleat, and Infallible Rule of Faith; the Atheiſtical Cavils of the Pamphleter notwithſtanding.

THough Proteſtants do not cheat the World with a pretence of an infallible viſible Judge, yet with the truly Catholick Church, they acknowledge, there is an infallible Rule of Faith, namely, the holy Scriptures of God, which are ſufficient, through the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, to guide Souls in the way of Salvation. But among the manifold impieties of the Papal Religion, the indignities put upon the holy Scriptures by Romaniſts are not the leaſt: I ſhall therefore firſt give an hint of ſome of theſe indignities, then briefly open the ſtate of this Queſtion, concerning the Rule of Faith, and confirm our Aſſertion, that Scripture is the Rule: Thirdly, examine the Pamphleters four principal Objections: And laſtly, reflect a little on the reſt of his Rapſodick Diſcourſe touching this Subject.

SECT. I.

Some hints of Indignities put upon the Holy Scripture by Romaniſts.

IN the firſt place, They are not afraid to ſpeak moſt contumelioufly of the Scriptures, calling them *A Noſe of Wax, a Lesbian Rule, inkie, unſenſed Characters, a dead Letter, &c.* It is from *Melchior Canus, Albertus Pighius, Coſter* the Jeſuit, and other Romaniſts, that the Quakers have learned theſe, or ſuch like Blaſphemies.

Secondly, They make the *Authority of the Scriptures, as to us, to depend upon the teſtimony of their Church.* So *Gordon* of *Huntly, controv. 2. de Eccleſ. cap. 15.* and *Gretſer Append. ad lib. 1. Bell. de verb. Dei col. 39.* Whoſe ears would not tingle at that ſaying of *Hermannus, that the Scriptures ſhould be of no more value, than Æſops Fables, without the Churches teſtimony.* Yet *Gretſer* the Jeſuit is diſpleaſed with *Rullus* for charging it with Blaſphemy; yea Cardinal *Hoſius* in *Confutatione Erentii lib. 3. de Author. Sacræ Scripturæ,*

pag.

pag. 148. *edit.* 2. *Antwerp* 1561. ſpares not to ſay, *Illud pio ſenſu potuiſſe dici*, that it might have been ſpoken in a pious ſenſe, and withal adds this reaſon, *Nam revera niſi Eccleſiæ nos doceret Authoritas hanc Scripturam eſſe Canonicam, prexiguum apud nos pondus haberet*; that is, for truly if the Authority of the Church, he means the Roman, did not teach us this to be Canonick Scripture, it would have exceeding little weight with us: From that Romiſh Atheiſtical Piety, good Lord deliver us. Learned *Rivet* in *Iſagog. ad ſcript. cap.* 3. giveth an account of many ſuch Blaſphemies belched out by Jeſuit *Baylie*, *Coſter*, *Petrus Simonis de Toledo*, and other Romaniſts.

Thirdly, *Romaniſts have confidence to affirm, that the Original Scriptures are corrupted.* So *Gordon* of *Huntly*, *controv.* 1. *cap.* 8, 9, 11, 12. *Melchior Canus loc. com. lib.* 2. *cap.* 13. *Leo Caſtrius*, *Morinus Tirin*, &c. Yea, this Pamphleter *Sect.* 4. makes it a great part of his work to prove, that the Scriptures are corrupted, both in the Originals, and in the Tranſlations. Is not this to accuſe the Providence of God, as ſuffering the Scriptures, which he had given to lead us to Salvation, to be corrupted? Is it not to charge the Catholick Church of unfaithfulneſs, that ſhe was not more careful of ſo rich a *depoſitum*? How deſperate muſt the cauſe of their infallible Judge be, when his Infallibility cannot be maintained, unleſs the holy Scriptures be diſcredited as corrupt, the Catholick Church accuſed of unfaithfulneſs, and God robbed of the praiſes due to him for preſerving the Scriptures?

Fourthly, Neither is it a ſmall indignity to the Scriptures, *that they preſer the muddy ſtream of the Vulgar Latine, before the Originals of the Old and New Teſtament.* Yet that Latine Verſion was not made by a perſon acted by a Prophetical and infallible Spirit. What confuſion and uncertainty they labour under, as to the Author of it, may be gathered from *Ludov. de Tena. Iſagog. Sac. ſcript. lib.* 1. *difficult.* 5. *Sect.* 2. yea it hath often been convicted of many errours, and therefore that which was extant in the time of the Council of *Trent*, was corrected by *Sixtus Quintus*, that of *Sixtus* by *Clement* the 8. and that of *Clement* the 8. accuſed by *Iſidore Clarius* of many errours; nor can *Clement* himſelf abſolutly aſſert its freedom from errour: And yet the Council of *Trent*, paſſing by the Originals, pronounces the Vulgar Latin to be the Authentick Scripture: Yea *Ludov de Tena lib. cit. difficult.* 2. *Sect.* 4. Says that the Hebrew Text is to be corrected by the Vulgar Latin. Such folly is wittily checked by *Hierom*, *Epiſt.* 102. *ad Marcellam. Si diſplicet fontis munda puriſſimi ſenoſos bibant rivulos.*

Fifth-

Fifthly, Romaniſts *accuſe the Scripture of Imperfection, as not containing all the material Objects of Faith.* So Eckius in *Enchirid. cap.* 4. *Coſter* in *Enchirid. lib.* 2. *cap.* 5. *Bell. lib.* 4. *de verb. Dei, cap.* 3, 4. *Greg. de Valen. de Analyſ. fidei, lib.* 8. *cap.* 6. *Gordon* of *Huntly, contov.* 1. *de verb. Dei, cap.* 28. *num.* 4. ſays, that it is the leaſt part of the Word of God which is contained in Scripture: Nay, D *Beard* in *Retract. Mat.* 6. reports, that *Hoſius* ſhould have dared to ſay, *Melius actum fuiſſe cum Eccleſia ſi nullum extaret ſcriptum Evangelium*; it had been for the Churches advantage that there had been no written Goſpel. I tremble to tranſcribe ſuch Blaſphemy. Doth not the Council of *Trent Seſſ.* 4. define, that unwritten Traditions are to be received *pari pietatis affectu*, with the ſame reverence and devotion, as the Scripture it ſelf. Yea, they magnifie Tradition above the holy Scripture. Hence *Spondanus*, the Epitomator of *Baronius*, ſpares not to affirm *ad annum* 53. *num.* 4. *Traditiones excellere ſupra Scripturas*, that Traditions have an Excellency above the Scriptures, and confirms it by this reaſon, *Quod Scripturæ non ſubſiſterent, niſi Traditionibus firmarentur, Traditiones vero ſine Scripturis ſuam obtinent firmitatem.*

Sixthly, Romaniſts *accuſe the Scriptures in their greateſt purity, with ſuch obſcurity, ambiguity, and multitude of deſperate ſenſes, that they cannot inſtruct us in the way of Salvation, but as they are ſenſed by the Romiſh infallible Judge.* Hence are many of thoſe ignominious expreſſions, which *Coſter*, *Melchior Canus*, *Pighius*, and others, belch out againſt the Scripture, as ſuffering themſelves to be wire-drawn by any interpretation. *Greg. de Valen. lib.* 5. *de Analyſ. fidei, cap.* 2. is bold to ſay that the collation of Scriptures is ſo far from terminating Controverſies, *ut magis augeat*, that it rather encreaſes them: Yea, D. *Beard* relates of *Pelargus* the Jeſuit, *that we read in Scripture that an Aſs did ſpeak, but never that the Scripture it ſelf ſpeaks*: So that this Romaniſt makes the Scriptures more mute than *Balaams* Aſs; than which (as ſaith the Doctor) what could be brayed more like the Beaſt he ſpake of.

Seventhly, *They prohibit the Verſion of the Scriptures into Vulgar Languages, and the people to read the Scripture.* Hence Cardinal *Tolet, lib.* 1. *de inſtruct. Sacerd. cap.* 10. *Sect.* 9. reckons the Bible among prohibited Books; and *Ludov. de Tena* in *Iſagog. ſac. ſcript. lib.* 1. *difficul.* 3. *Sect.* 1. acknowledges, that in the Catalogue of prohibited Books ſet forth by Cardinal *Quiroga Reg.* 6. *omnia Biblia in Lingua vulgari prohibentur*; all Bibles whatſoever in a Vulgar Tongue

are prohibited: And that they are as peremptorily prohibited in a late Catalogue, publiſhed at the Command of Cardinal *Bernard de Rojas*, and *Sandoval Reg.* 4. *Alphonſus à Caſtro lib.* 4. *de hæreſ. cap.* 13. pronounces the reading of Bibles to be the cauſe of Errours in Religion; and therefore commends *Ferdinand*, King of *Spain*, for prohibiting, under higheſt pains, the Tranſlations of Bibles into Vulgar Languages, or the importing of ſuch Bibles, or having them in ones cuſtody. *Sixtus Senenſis* is of the ſame Opinion, *lib.* 6. *Bib. Annot.* 152. and Jeſuit *Azorius*, *Tom.* 1. *Inſtit. Moral. lib.* 8. *cap.* 26. *q.* 3. affirms it to be an Hereſie in *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts*, to aſſert, that the Scriptures ought to be tranſlated into Vulgar Languages: It's true, *Bell. lib.* 2. *de verb Dei*, *cap.* 15. ſpeaks of a power to give Licenſes to read the Scripture in Vulgar Languages, granted by *Pius* the 4. to Biſhops, Inquiſitors, and Confeſſors; but it is as true, that that power was either given only by a Cheat, or recalled by after-Popes, as is evicted by *Rivet* in *Iſagog. cap.* 13. *Sect.* 14. from the Index of prohibited Books; as recognized by *Clement* 8. in *obſervat. circa Reg.* 4. The ſame obſerve of Pope *Clement* the 8. his annulling the power of giving Licenſes, is improved by Jeſuit *Azorius*, *loc. cit.* whereupon at length he concludes, that the Bible, or any part thereof, in any Vulgar Tongue, is prohibited, which, ſays he, *inviolate præcipitur ſervandum*, *i. e.* is commanded to be inviolably obſerved: Neither do their Prohibitions reach only Verſions made by Hereticks, but alſo made by Catholicks. Yea, *Reginald* in *Calvino-Turciſmo lib.* 4. *cap.* 7. is bold to conclude, *Tranſlationes penitus ſupprimendas, etiamſi divina & Apoſtolica niterentur authoritate*, that Tranſlations of Scripture are utterly to be ſuppreſſed, though they were warranted by Divine and Apoſtolick Authority: is not this more like the concluſion of a Turk, than of a Chriſtian? And when they grant Licenſes, it's meerly out of neceſſity, when they ſee people would not be reſtrained from reading Verſions, as *Greiſer* acknowledges in *defenſ. Bell. lib.* 2. *de verb. Dei*, *cap.* 15. How contrary is this to the Inſtitution of God, who cauſed writ the Scripture in vulgar, or commonly underſtood Tongues, and commanded all to ſearch the Scriptures; neither can themſelves deny, but it is againſt the practiſe of the Primitive Church, as may be ſeen in *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, and *Sixtus Senenſis loc. cit.* Were the people to be ſecluded from reading the Scripture? Would the Apoſtle *John* have written one of his Epiſtles to a Woman? Would *Hierom Epiſt.* 16. or *Paulinus*, give this advice to *Celantia*, *ſint Divinæ Scripturæ*

ſemper

ſemper in manibus tuis, let the Divine Scriptures be always in thy hands: Or would that ſame *Hierom Epiſt.* 22. recommend to *Euſtochium* not to deſiſt from reading the Scriptures, until being overcome with ſleep, her head fell down, as it were, to ſalute the leafs of the Book, *tenenti codicem ſomnus obrepat, & cadentem faciem Pagina ſancta ſuſcipiat.* Do not therefore our Romiſh Adverſaries draw on themſelves the Curſe, *Luke* 11. 52. *Woe unto you Lawyers, ye have taken away the Key of Knowledge, ye enter not in your ſelves, and them that were entering in ye hindred.*

Eighthly and laſtly, Not to mention more at this time, do not their *Canoniſts give the Pope power to diſpence with Scripture Commands, and Prohibitions*; and though their Divines ſeem not to go the full length of the Canoniſts, yet they can reconcile themſelves by a diſtinction, as may be ſeen in *Azor. Part.* 2. *Inſtit. Moral. lib.* 4. *cap.* 18. where he poſitively affirms that Canoniſts commonly aſſert, *Poſſe Romanum Pontificem jus divinum declarare, interpretari, reſtringere, remittere, ampliſicare, angere & mutare*; *i. e.* that the Pope of *Rome* may declare, interpret, reſtrict, remit, amplifie, inlarge, and change the Divine Law. And though he bring in the Divines Opinion ſomewhat otherwiſe, yet he grants they alſo maintain, that the Pope may *hunc vel illum a Juris Divini rigore eximere*, exempt this or that perſon from the rigour of the Divine Law. And by virtue of this diſtinction, betwixt abrogation of Divine Law, and exemption of a man from the rigour of Divine Law, he ſays Canoniſts and Divines may be fully reconciled. I will rake no further in this Dunghill; I only leave it to be conſidered, whether that forged Coat of Arms of which the Pamphleter talks, *viz.* a reverſed Bible (for it's no wonder that Jeſuits adventure on falſe Heraldry, who are ſo bold in preaching Hereſies) would not better ſuit with Jeſuited Romaniſts, who are ſo many ways injurious to the holy Scriptures, than with a Proteſtant.

SECT. II.

The ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the Rule of Faith, opened, and the Scriptures briefly proved to be the Rule.

SHould I inſiſt to prove the abſurdity of each of the indignities done by Romaniſts to the holy Scriptures, this Tractate would ſwell to a nimious bigneſs. I ſhall therefore, at the time, pitch upon

that one particular mentioned in the Title of this Chapter, *viz.* whether the Scriptures be the principal and compleat Rule of Faith.

Excellently did *Varinus* describe a Rule, μετρὸν ἀδιαψευστὸν προσθεσὶν καὶ ἀφαιρεσὶν μηδαμῶς ἐπιδεχόμενον; *i. e.* an infallible measure, which neither admits addition nor diminution: And therefore by the principal and compleat Rule of Faith, I understand the chief and adequate Standard or measure, by which we are to judge of all the Articles of Religion, or material objects of our Faith: So that whatever is not warranted by, and agreeable to that Standard and measure, is to be rejected as no point of our Faith. In this sense we affirm the Scriptures to be the compleat and principal Rule of Faith, and of all true Religion. I call the Scripture the principal Rule of Faith, to distinguish it from other subordinate Rules: For Learned Protestants have granted, that Tradition, and the Doctrine of the Ancient Church, may in a large sense be termed Rules of Faith; but so as they are to be reduced to, and examined by this principal Rule of the holy Scriptures. It's true, D. *Sanderson de oblig. Consc. prælect.* 4. *Sect.* 14, 15. denies the Rule of Faith, and of Life, to be adequately the same, supposing that natural reason, in some things, may be the Rule of Life, and the rather, seeing Heathens had a Rule, to which in some measure they might conform their actions, which could be none else but Reason, and the innate principles of Morality: But the Rule of Divine Faith must be Divine Revelation, which the said Learned Doctor, with other Protestants, maintains against Romanists, to be Scriptural. Yea further he acknowledges, *Sect.* 15. 19. the Scripture to be the adequate Rule of Life also, in so far as our actions are spiritual, and directed to a supernatural end. As for Romanists, so well are they served by their infallible Judge, and so far are they from that Unity whereof they boast, that they are broken into a multitude of Opinions, touching the Rule of their Faith and Religion.

For first, many old School-men, as *Aquinas* 2. 2. *q.* 1. *art.* 10. and *Part.* 3. *q.* 1. *art.* 3. in *corp. Scotus Prolog. in sent. q.* 2. *Durand Præfat. in lib. sent.* seem to affirm with us, that Scripture is the compleat Rule of Faith, wherein all supernatural Truths, necessary to be believed, are revealed. But secondly, *Bell. lib.* 4. *de verb Dei, cap.* 10. *Bean. Theol. Schol. Part.* 3. *Tract.* 1. *cap.* 7. *Sect.* 5. and others say, that the Scripture is only a partial Rule, the compleat Rule consisting of the whole Word of God, written, and unwritten. There be others,

thers, thirdly, as *Alphonſus à Caſtro, lib.* 1. *cont. hæreſ. cap.* 5. *Greg. de Val. de Analyſ. fidei lib.* 5. *cap.* 2. *Suarez de tripl. virt. tract.* 1. *diſp.* 5. *Sect.* 2. *Sect.* 5. *Petrus à S. Joſeph in Idea Theol. Moral. lib.* 3. *cap.* 2. *Reſol.* 5, 6, 7. who ſay, that the compleat Rule comprizes not only the Scripture and unwritten Traditions, but alſo the definitions of the Church; *i. e.* of Pope and Council. But fourthly, there appears another party among them who would degrade the Scriptures from being any part of the principal Rule of Faith at all, aſcribing that entirely to Tradition. For this, Learned *Rives* in *Iſagog. cap.* 3. cites, among others, *Albertus Pighius*, ſaying, *Legem Chriſtianam differre à vetere, quod Traditionis tantum ſit, non Scripturæ*, that the Chriſtian Law in this differs from the old Law, that it conſiſts only in Tradition. Jeſuit *Coſter* alſo, *lib.* 2. *Enchirid. cap.* 1. makes only the perpetual Tradition of the Church to be the principal Rule of Faith: *Chriſtus enim, nec Eccleſiam à chartaceis Scriptis pendere, nec membranis myſteria ſua committere voluit*: For Chriſt (ſaith he) would not have his Church to depend upon Paper-writings, neither would he commit his Myſteries to Membrans. *Chamier lib.* 1. *de can. cap.* 2. *Sect.* 9. ſhews the ſame to be the Doctrine of *Caranza*, which being objected in a Diſpute to *Gautier* the Jeſuit, *Gautier* ſeemed ſo much aſhamed of it, that he undertook to get it Cenſured with a *deleatur*, by Papal Authority. But though they have expunged many things that made for the honour of Scripture, whereof *Chamier ibid. Sect.* 10. gives inſtances from *Quivoga's Index expurgatorius*, yet that impious Doctrine of *Caranza*, ſo derogatory to Scripture, ſtands, for what I know, without Cenſure to this day. Yea, *Bell.* himſelf, though with one breath, he acknowledgeth the Scriptures to be a part of the Rule of Faith; and *lib.* 1. *de verb. Dei cap.* 1. adorns them with that high Elogy, as being *certa & ſtabilis regula Fidei*: yet with another, as it were revoking this, *lib.* 4. *de verb. Dei, cap.* 12. *Sect. Reſpondeo ad majorem*, peremptorily denies this to be *finem proprium & præcipuum Scripturæ ut eſſet regula fidei, ſed ut eſſet commonitorium quoddam*, the proper and principal end of the Scripture to be the Rule of Faith, but only that it might be a certain Commonitory. Fifthly, M. *Whit, Ruſhworth*, and *Serjeant*, have made no little noiſe, of late, with the notion of Oral Tradition, as being the Rule of Faith. The difference betwixt theſe two laſt Opinions, may perhaps be taken thus, according to the Opinion of *Coſter*, Faith muſt be reſolved into the Tradition of the Church, thorough all ſucceſſive Ages, from the time of the Apoſtles, to this day:

but

but according to M. *Whyt*, and his Complices, into the Oral testimony of the present Church. Sixthly and lastly, *Gordon* of *Huntly* in *Epitome controv. Tom.* 1. *controv.* 2. *cap.* 15. makes the Rule of Faith to be the definition of the present Church, which, says he, gives not only testimony, but Authority to the Scriptures, and this appeareth to be the mind of this Pamphleter: For *pag.* 75. he says, *When Questions arise concerning Scriptures, the Doctrine of Fathers, yea and Traditions themselves, then all is to be resolved into the definition of the present Church*; that is surely, into the sentence of their infallible visible Judge: By all which it may appear, Romanists have no certain Rule of Faith, they being so divided about it. But though, like *Sampson*'s Foxes, they look contrary ways, yet they agree generally against us (unless you except those Ancient School-men) to assert, that Scripture is not the principal and compleat Rule of Faith. In this Negative, *Quakers* (who make their Enthusiasms, and Light within, to be the Rule of Faith) do joyn with Romanists in opposition to us.

It is observable, that though some diversity may be found in the writings of Reformed Divines in expounding the formal object of Faith, yet so far as I have hitherto learned, they are all agreed in the great Point now under debate, viz. *That the Scripture is the principal and compleat Rule of Faith.* For they who hold, as do the most, the formal object of Faith to be a compound of the Veracity of God, and of Divine Revelation, do accordingly affirm Scriptural Revelation to be the principal and adequate measure, or Rule, according to which we are to judge of all material objects or Articles of Faith: They likewise who conceive the formal object of Faith, solely and entirely to consist in the Veracity of God alone, as doth Learned and Judicious M. *Baxter* in the Preface to *Part.* 2. of his *Saints Rest*, do yet acknowledge *that Scriptural Revelation is the principal mean by which the Veracity of God is applied to all the material objects, or particular Articles of Faith*; and consequently, by them also the Scripture is held to be the chief and compleat Standard, Measure, or Rule, by which all Articles of Faith are to be judged. In this surely M. *Chillingworth*, *Richard Hooker*, *Richard Baxter*, *&c.* agree with other Protestant Authors. The difference betwixt these Divines, as to this, appears reducible to that School-question, whether Divine Revelation be a part of the formal object of Faith, or only a condition requisite, that we may upon the Veracity of God believe the material objects or particular Articles of Faith. There be great

School-

School-men for both theſe Opinions, without cenſure of Hereſie on either hand, as may be ſeen in *Carleton Theol. Schol. Tom.* 2. *diſp.* 4. *Sect.* 2. & 3. Would Romaniſts therefore grant, that Scriptural Revelation is the principal mean by which the Veracity of God is applied to all the materia! objects of Faith, ſo as this were the Standard by which we are to judge of all Articles of Faith. I ſhould not much contend with them, whether they looked on Scriptural Revelation as a part of the formal object of Faith, or only as a requiſite condition to our believing upon the Veracity of God; but how far they are from this, may appear by the account I have given of their Opinions in the foregoing *Paragraph*; it not being my concern, at the time, to debate that Queſtion of the formal object of Faith, I ſhall abſtract from it, and keep cloſe to this, *of the Rule of Faith*; in which all Reformed Divines are agreed againſt Papiſts and Quakers, that Scripture is the principal, compleat, and infallible Rule of Faith.

I ſhall not dilate upon Arguments to confirm the Orthodox Aſſertion, this hath been done copiouſly by *Whittaker* againſt *Stapleton*, *lib.* 3. *de Author. Script. Chamier Tom.* 1. *Panſtrat. lib.* 1. and very lately by *Tillotſon* againſt *J. S.* much leſs can it be expected that I ſhould enter upon a particular refutation of all thoſe errours, concerning the Rule of Faith, into which Romaniſts and Quakers are ſubdivided, I hope it ſhall ſuffice, by ſome brief hints, to evict the Scriptures to be the principal and compleat Rule of Faith, whereby the contrary notions of Adverſaries, in all hands, will vaniſh into ſmoak: Only this I muſt not omit, that though Papiſts talk bigly of Univerſal Tradition, and conſent of Fathers, yet if either of theſe were made the Teſt, Popery would be found not to be the true Chriſtian Religion. So fearful are Romaniſts of theſe diſcriminating Teſts, that ſometimes they ſpare not to ſay, as *Melchior Canus*, *lib.* 7. *cap.* 1. that though all the Fathers with one mouth own a Doctrine, yet the contrary may be piouſly defended; and of Traditions, the *Fratres Valenburgii in examin. princip. examin.* 3. *Num.* 64. affirm, *ut Traditio aliqua ſit Apoſtolica nihil detrimenti eam accipere, licet aliquando in Eccleſia de ea dubitatum ſit*; yea this Pamphleter confeſſes, *pag.* 75. *that ſuch doubts may be moved concerning Fathers and Traditions, that at length all muſt be reſolved into the definition of the preſent viſible Judge.* My work therefore ſhall be to hold out the Scripture to be the principal and compleat Rule of Faith, whereby it will appear that other pretended Rules, either are not true Rules, or but ſubordinate to the Scriptures.

Did

Did not our Lord Jesus in all his Debates with Devils or Hereticks appeal to the Scriptures, and never to the Decretals of High-Priests, or unwritten Tradition? But it's written, *Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures.* Are we not remitted for decision of all Controversies to the Rule of the Scripture? *Isai.* 8 20. *Joh.* 5.39. Are not Scripture-Saints commended for improving this Rule? *Act.* 17. 11. Are we not commanded so to cleave to Scripture, as not to decline from it, either to the right hand, or to the left? *Deut.* 5. 32. *Deut.* 17. 18. 20. *Deut.* 28. 13. 14. *Josh.* 1. 7. 8. Is there not an *Anathema* pronounced upon all who broach any Doctrine, not only contrary to, but beside the Scripture, whether Apostle or Angel? *Gal.* 1 8, 9. Which Scripture is expounded by *Chrysost. in locum*, *Basil in Moral. Reg.* 72. and *Augustine lib.* 3. *cont. lit. Petil. cap.* 6. of the written Word; who then shall secure the Pope, when he obtrudes his Præter-anti-scriptural Oracles? Is not the Scripture given for this end, *that we may believe, and believing have eternal life?* *Joh.* 20. 31. Is it not called the Canon or Rule? *Gal.* 6. 16. Is not the Scripture the Rule, by which all within the Church, and to whom the Gospel is preached, are to be judged at the Great Day? *Rom.* 2. 16. *Joh.* 12. 48. *Jam.* 2. 12. Must it not then be the Rule according to which we are to believe and walk? Can there be any more Noble or infallible Rule thought of than the Scriptures of the Living God? Is it not said to be more sure, βεβαιοτερος, than a Voice from Heaven? 2 *Pet.* 1. 19. Was it not so evident of old, that the Scriptures were the Rule of the Christian Religion, that the Adversaries of Christianity made it their great design to destroy the Bible, thinking thereby to extirpate Christianity out of the world? But this should have been, as M. *Tillotson* observes, *Serm.* 3. *pag.* 20. malice without wit, according to Romish Principles: For had all the Bibles in the world been burnt, Christian Religion would nevertheless been entirely preserved by Tradition, and the definitions of the infallible visible Judge, nay the Church had been a gainer thereby, for the occasion and Parent of all Heresie, the Scripture, being out of the way, she should have had all in her own hands, which Romanists are still grasping after. But suppose the Enemies of Christianity mistook their design, how came the Christians in those days to be so tenacious of this Book, that rather then deliver it, they would yield up themselves to torments and death? why did they look upon those that delivered up the Scriptures, as Renouncers of Christianity, whom therefore they called *Traditores*, if they had not looked on this Book as the

Rule

Rule of their Faith, and chief mean of their Salvation? Were not those who suffered for not delivering up the Scriptures, Confessors and Martyrs for this great Article of the Religion of Protestants, *that the Scripture is the Rule of Faith?*

Is there any thing in the world, to which the properties of the principal Rule of Faith do so quadrate, as to the holy Scriptures? Must the Rule of Faith be 1. Certain both in it self, and as to us. 2. Intelligible. 3. Comprehensive of all the material objects of Faith. 4. Independent as to its Authority from any prior Rule of Faith. And 5. A publick Standard by which the Church may convince gain sayers? Is there any thing to which all these are so exactly competent, as to the Scriptures?

And 1. For *Certainty*; how uncertain the infallibility of the Romish visible Judge is, we have already cleared? But the testimonies of the Lord are sure, *Psal.* 19. 7. yea more sure than a Voice from Heaven, 2 *Pet.* 1. 19. If the motives of credibility firmly demonstrate any thing, it is this. Can any writing in the Earth compare with the Scriptures, as to Antiquity? Have they not been miraculously preserved, though *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and the Roman Emperours, &c. so industriously endeavoured their utter abolition, whereas many other Books of excellent use have really perished, upon whose ruine men had no such design? Hath not the truth of the Scriptures been solemnly attested by the Heroick constancy of Martyrs, of all Sexes and Ages, under most exquisite torments, whose resolutenes could not proceed either from the greatnes of a natural spirit, affectation of vain-glory, want of sense of their sufferings, or Philosophical fortitude, but from a firm perswasion of the Divine Original of the Scriptures? Hath not the same been confirmed by most stupendious Miracles, wrought not in corners, or only among Favourites, but in the open view of the world, in the face of sagacious and desperate Enemies, who yet could never find a Cheat in one of them? Hath not God signalized the Enemies of holy Scripture with remarkable Judgments from Heaven? among whom were *Theopompus* and *Theodectes*, one of whom, as *Eusebius lib.* 8. *de præpar Evang. cap.* 5. reports out of *Aristæus*, was smitten with Madness, and the other with Blindness, for attempting to prophane the holy Scriptures? Hath not the Scripture a mighty influence on Consciences, beyond all natural force, both for terrour and comfort, yea, and for sanctification also? And besides, are there not invincible Characters of a Divine Original inherent to the Scriptures? such as

the incomparable ſanctity of Scripture Precepts, the unfathomable ſublimity of Scripture-Myſteries, which though Reaſon could never find out, yet being once diſcovered, Reaſon it ſelf cannot but acknowledge to be admirably ſuitable for bringing about the ſalvation of ſouls, the inimitable Majeſtick ſimplicity of the ſtile, the wonderful methods for ſatisfying Divine Juſtice, reconciling ſinners to God, and pacifying afflicted Conſciences. And laſtly, not to mention more, the Native tendency of the whole Scriptures to ingage all men to the ſerious ſtudy of holineſs, and to the hatred of all manner of wickedneſs, by the moſt powerful and rational motives imaginable; inſomuch that it's beyond controverſie amongſt Chriſtians, though otherwiſe of various perſwaſions, that the Scripture is the Word of God: Hence *Bell.* is forced to ſay, *lib.* 1. *de verb. Dei, cap.* 2 *Scripturis nihil eſt certius, nihil eſt notius*; and a little after, *Sacra Scriptura regula credendi certiſſima, tutiſſimaque eſt*, that is, the Scripture is the moſt certain and moſt ſafe Rule of believing: Nay more, he concludes him an errant Fool who derogates Faith from the Scriptures, his words are, *Ut ſtultiſſimum eſſe neceſſe ſit qui illis fidem eſſe habendam neget.*

Secondly, If Scriptures were not *intelligible as to all things neceſſary to Salvation*, they ſhould not be ſufficient for the end for which God made them, which is *Joh.* 20. 31. *That we may believe, and believing have eternal life.* If it be anſwered, that they accompliſh their end, in ſo far as their want of perſpicuity is ſupplied by the Church, or by the definitions of the infallible Judge, this is eaſily repelled, becauſe either the Church, and the infallible Judge, gather the underſtanding of theſe Myſteries which they clearly propound from Scripture, or not: if from Scripture, then Scripture did deliver them intelligibly, elſe could they not have been gathered from Scripture: if the Church, and the ſuppoſed infallible Judge, have not the knowledge of theſe Myſteries from the Scripture, then the Scriptures does not, cannot effectuate the end for which it was made, *viz.* to work Faith in us, and to guide us to Eternal Life, but that end is brought about by the Church, and by other means. Romaniſts (to uſe the phraſe of a late Writer) repreſent God ſpeaking in the Scriptures as a *Sphinx* uttering Riddles, that the Pope, and his Paraſites, may be reputed the only *Oedipus*'s in the world. But that ſaying of *Hilary* of *Poytiers*, *lib.* 10. *de Trinit.* is no leſs excellent than famous, *Non per difficiles nos Deus ad beatam vitam vocat quæſtiones —— In abſoluto nobis & facili eſt æternitas.* How impious

impious is it to say, that the Romish Church in her definitions speaks more clearly than God in the Scriptures? Were not the Canons of the Council of *Trent* of purpose dubiously conceived, to satisfie different interests? Have not great Doctors that were present in the Council put contrary senses on the Canons thereof? Though Papists, and other Hereticks, do accuse the Scripture as unintelligible, yet doth not their own practice, at other times, confute them? Do they not argue from the Scriptures for their Opinions? How impertinent were this kind of arguing, if Scripture were not intelligible? Neither can it be said, that they argue thus only, *ad hominem*, against us; for though we acknowledge the perspicuity of the Scriptures, yet not the Romish glosses imposed on the Scriptures, and therefore these arguings could have no significancy against us, unless they supposed they could bring grounds from Scripture to prove their glosses to be true: Yea, does not this Pamphleter, *pag.* 106, 107, 108, 109. heap up a multitude of Scriptures *which he supposes are expresi against the Doctrine of Protestants?* These Scriptures shall be considered in their own place: Now only, doth not his alledging them, suppose them intelligible, especially seeing he proposes them so nakedly without the Comment of any infallible Judge upon them? 'Tis true, there be obscure places in Scripture, yet as *Austin lib. de util. credendi cap* 6. excellently observes, the Divine Wisdom hath so modified and tempered the Scriptures, *ut nemo inde haurire non possit quod sibi satis est, si modo ad hauriendum devotè & piè, ut vera Religio p scit, accedat*; i. e. that any man may learn from them what is sufficient to his salvation, providing he search them with that pious devotion which becomes a Religious Enquirer. And again, *Serm.* 11. *de verbis Dom. Pascimur apertis, exercemur obscuris, ibi fames pellitur, hic fastidium*; i. e. clear Scriptures feed us, obscure places exercise us; by the one our hunger is satisfied, by the other our loathing is prevented. And *Greg. Præfat. ad Leandrum*, before his Commentaries on *Job*, the Scripture is a River, *Planus & altus, in quo & agnus ambulet, & Elephas natet*, both shallow and deep, wherein a Lamb may walk, and an Elephant swim.

Thirdly, Doth not the Scriptures *comprehend all material objects of Faith?* Are they not able to make us wise unto salvation? 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. How could they accomplish this end, if they did not contain all that is necessary to salvation? If Romanists run to their old Evasion, that what is wanting in the Scripture, is supplied by the Church, they are readily confuted, for then the Scripture were not

able to make us wise to salvation, but the Church by other means should do it: If the Church have truths not contained in Scripture, either they are more sublime than these in Scripture, or not: Not more sublime: Are there more sublime Mysteries of Christianity than the Mysteries of the Trinity, Incarnation, Resurrection, all which are undoubtedly in Scripture. If then they be but inferiour Truths, seeing God committed the most sublime Mysteries to writing, how kept he up those inferiour Truths? But whence hath the Church the knowledge of those Mysteries not contained in Scripture? if they say from Oral Tradition, then Oral Tradition should rather be the Rule of Faith, than the sentence of the infallible Judge, which, I doubt, if the Jesuited party will admit, I appeal to all the Romanists in the world, to instance one Article of Faith conveyed down by Universal Tradition, and not contained in the Scripture? Is there any dogmatical Controversie betwixt Romanists and us, for which they pretend not Scripture? Is not this a practical testimony to the fulness of Scripture, as comprehending all material objects of Faith, which at other times they dispute against?

The chief difficulty that here can be moved is, *that Scripture cannot prove its own Original to be Divine, or define the number of Canonical Books.* Not to insist upon many things which may be replied, this alone, at this time, may suffice, that though what is objected were true, yet Scripture would not cease to be the Rule of Faith; it being sufficient, that the Rule of Faith doth determine all questions about the material objects of Faith; whereas the Books of holy Scripture are either a part of the formal object of Faith, or at least a condition belonging thereto; or to speak more plainly, they are the Rule of Faith it self: Nay, this is such a Pedantick Sophism, as if to use M. *Chillingworth's* example in his safe way to salvation, *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 27. When a Merchant shewing his own ship, containing all his stock, says all his substance is in such a ship, one should infer, that either the ship were no part of his substance, or that the ship were in her self; whereas the Merchants expression imports no more, but that all his goods distinct from the ship were contained therein. So if Scripture be able to determine all questions of Religion, concerning the material objects of Faith, though those, which relate to its being the Rule, receive Evidence another way, it loses nothing of this property of the Rule of Faith. And to shew that Romanists are no less concerned in this objection than we, I ask if they can assign any Rule of Faith that can resolve all questions which may be moved

concerning

concerning it self; as whether Oral Tradition, or the definition of the visible Judge be the Rule; or which soever of these be pitched upon, can it prove its own infallibility? can it resolve what Articles of Faith are only to be learned by unwritten Tradition, and not at all by Scripture, or who is the subject of Infallibility, whether the Pope or Council, or both conjunctly? Is it not like that before, they produce a Rule of Faith to resolve these and such like questions, they will betake themselves to our Answer, that it's not requisite that the questions which concern the being of the Rule of Faith, be resolved by the Rule it self, only I must mind them, that these things must at least have evidence from some other head, which I doubt will hardly be found, concerning the questions last mentioned: But the questions which they move to us concerning the Divine Original of the Scriptures, and the number of Canonick Books, receive a clear determination, partly from the motives of Credibility, as Romanists themselves confess, concerning all the Books which we hold as Canonical. The like cannot be said of their *Apocrypha* Books, as shall appear *Sect.* 3. and *Append.* 1. to *cap.* 7. and partly by the intrinsick Characters of a Divine Original, for those are inherent to all the Books of Scripture, and to no other writing, consequently those give evidence of their Divine Extract, though not by a formal testimony. I shall not here insist upon the reflex testimony which Scripture gives to its own Divine Original, 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. *All Scripture is given by inspiration of God*, or of the ground which is given, *Rom.* 3. 2. to disprove the *Apocrypha* Books as no part of the sacred Canon of the Old Testament, in as much as the Scripture of the Old Testament was delivered to the Jewish Church, which certainly never owned the *Apocrypha* Books as part of the Scriptures, as is clear from *Josephus*, *lib.* 1. against *Appion.* Yet because we must first suppose the Divine Original of those testimonies, before we argue from them; therefore I rest on what I have said: What need I more, so full are the Scriptures, that *Basil Serm. de vera fide*, concludes it a manifest falling from the Faith, φανερὰν ἔκπτωσιν πίστεως, and a certain proof of pride ἢ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν γε γραμμένων, ἢ ἐπεισαγειν τι τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων, either to reject any thing thing that is written, or to introduce any thing that is not written.

Fourthly, *Doth the Authority of the Scriptures depend upon any* prior *Rule*; if there were any, should it not be either Tradition, or the definition of the Church not Tradition? The most that the Council of *Trent* dared to say for Traditions, was to equal them with

with the *Scripture*, to be received *pari pietatis affectu*; but if they were a Prior Rule, upon whose Authority the Authority of *Scripture* did depend, they should be preferred to the *Scripture*. I acknowledge Tradition to have a chief place among the motives of Credibility, preparing us to believe the *Scripture*; Tradition, I say, not of the Church only, but also of Infidels: Yea, the testimony of Infidels, in this case, may perhaps be more convincing than the testimony of the Church, for Enemies cannot be supposed to be corrupted by interest, to give testimony against their own selves: Nor will, I hope, Romanists be so impudent, as to say, that the testimony of Infidels is the Rule of Faith? If Tradition of the Church were to be the Rule, either it must be the Tradition of the Church under this Reduplication, as being the Church, or as the Tradition and testimony of such prudent men: Not the first; for the Church cannot be known as a Church, but by the proper notes of the Church; and these cannot be had, but by the Rule of Faith, this being a part of our Faith, that these are the proper notes of the true Church, and consequently I must first know the Rule of Faith, before I know the Church under the reduplication of a Church. This, I suppose, will be found to be demonstratively conclusive: If therefore the Tradition of the Church only as the testimony of prudent men, be said to be the Rule, a meerly humane thing should be the principal Rule of the Christian Faith and Religion, which I believe no Christian, unless he be of a *Socinian* impression, will admit. I confess the concurring testimony, and Tradition of so many prudent men, who cannot be supposed to have colluded together upon any base design to cheat the World, may be so far convincing, as to shew that there is no rational ground of doubting the Divine Original of the Scriptures, and so may remove those prejudices which might have impeded our discovery of those intrinsick Rays of Majesty resplendent in the holy *Scriptures*, which are the chief Evidence of their Divine Original. But besides, giving, and not granting, that our assent to the Divine Original of the *Scriptures* were only founded upon the Churches Tradition, yet it doth not follow, that the Churches Tradition should be the principal Rule of Faith: Which I illustrate by two examples. It's granted by all, that the Veracity of God is the formal object of Faith, if not in whole, yet in part; but the first assent that is given to the Veracity of God, is surely founded upon Natural Reason: Yet *School*-men themselves will not admit that those Natural Reasons, which prove the Veracity of God,

are

are the formal object of Faith, as may be seen in *Lugo de fide, disp.* 1. *Sect.* 6. and *Carleton, Tom.* 2. *Theol Schol. disp.* 3. *Sect.* 2. & 3. Who would be further satisfied how Natural Reason is not the Rule of Faith and Religion, albeit Religion and Faith do presuppose Reason, I must remit them to the Debates of our Divines against *Socinians*, and to those betwixt the Paradoxal Author of *Philosophia Scripturæ Interpres*, and *Vogelsangius*, &c. Only now I conclude *à pari*, though Tradition alone should prove the Divine Original of the Scriptures, yet would it not necessarily follow, that Tradition were the principal Rule of Faith. I add another example, suppose the King sent a Letter to his Subjects, containing his pleasure, as to sundry particulars of moment, although the testimony of a Trusty Bearer might give Evidence, that the Letter were truly the Kings, yet would it be the Kings Letter, and not the Bearers testimony, that would be the rule of the Subjects obedience. The Applica ion is obvious. The same reasons demonstrate, that neither can the definitions of the Church be the first Rule of Faith, for we must know the Rule of Faith, before we know the Church as a Church, it being by the Rule of Faith that we have the knowledge of the notes of the Church. Nay further, the Church is built upon the Foundation of Prophets and Apostles, *Ephes.* 2. 20. that is, upon the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament: for as *Ethius* well observes, Prophets and Apostles are said to be the Foundation of the Church, *ratione Doctrinæ*, in respect of their Doctrine, but the Doctrine of the old Prophets was only preserved entirely and incorruptly in the Scriptures, for that the Traditions of those times were vitiated, Christ witnesses oftner than once. Shall the Law of the most High God receive Authority from his Creatures? Did *Moses*, when he received the Law from the mouth of the Lord, wait for the suffrages of the Church, or their Representatives, to make it Authentick? Whence have we the knowledge of the infallible and reciprocal notes of the Church, but from the Scripture? Then, surely, the belief of the Scripture must be presupposed to the distinct knowledge of the true Church, consequently our Faith cannot ultimately be resolved into the definitions of the Church.

Fifthly and lastly, Is not the Scripture *a publick Standard of Divine Truth, whereby the Church may convince Gain-sayers*? Doth not the Apostle, 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. say, that the Scripture is profitable for reproof, πρὸς ἔλεγχον, for evident conviction? Did not *Apollos*, *Act.* 18. 28. mightily convince the Jews by the Scriptures? Hence

Atha-

Athanasius, Orat. cont. gentes, Ἀυταρκεῖς μὲν γάρ εἰσιν αἱ ἁγίαι καὶ θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν; *i. e.* the sacred and divinely inspired Scriptures are abundantly sufficient for the Declaration of the truth: Nor do I doubt but the arguings of Protestants from the Scripture leave Convictions upon Jesuited Romanists, albeit, through interest and prejudice, they stifle them, and study Cavils against the clear light of Scripture. Can either the secret Enthusiasms of a Quaker be such a publick Standard and mean to convince others, or yet the Enthusiastick decisions of the Romish pretended infallible Judge, seeing he neither can give Evidence of his Infallibility, nor infallible grounds upon which he pronounces his sentences, else upon those grounds, without his sentence people might be convinced of the truth. By these hints, I hope it may appear, that the properties of the Rule of Faith, do exactly agree to the Scriptures, but no more to the decisions of the Romish infallible visible Judge, then to the Enthusiastick fancies of Quakers. I may not now digress to confute Quaker whimsies, concerning the light within, which they make the Rule of Faith; which I hope, e're long, shall be accurately done by the Pen of a Learned and Judicious person in this place.

If the judgment of Antiquity, as to this matter, be required, it were easie to fill a Volum. Take only a few touches, *Irenæus lib.* 3. *cap.* 1. calls the Scripture the Pillar and Ground of Truth: *Chrysost.* in 2 *Epist. ad Cor. Hom.* 13. calls the Scriptures ἀπαλῶν ἀκριβῆ ξυγὸν, καὶ γνώμονα, καὶ κανόνα, the exact Ballance, Rule, and Canon of all things: *Greg. Nyssen lib.* 3. *cont. Eunom. in Append. operum Basilii,* κριτήριον ἀσφαλὲς τῆς ἀληθείας ὅτι πάντως ἀναμάρτητος ὁ θεόπνευστος ἐστι μαρτυρία, that is, Jesus Christ being Interpreter, *In omni dogmate optima judicandi ratio est divinitus inspirata scriptura,* the divinely inspired Scripture is the best Rule by which we can judge of every Article of Faith. *Basil Epist.* 80. *ad Eustath.* calls the Scripture, νόμον καὶ κανόνα τῆς ὀρθῆς λόγου, the Law and Rule of that which is right. *Athanasius in Synopsi anchoras & sustentacula fidei,* the Anchors and Pillars of Faith. *Austin lib.* 2. *de bapt. cont. Donat. cap.* 6. *Stateras divinas,* Divine Ballances. *Tertull. lib.* 4. *cont. Marcion cap.* 3. the Christian digests, alluding to the Civil Law, which is a Rule in Law cases; and *Cassiod. lib.* 1. *Instit. cap.* 12. and 15. by a like allusion, the *Pandects. Bede* is very expreis, as cited by *Gratian caus.* 8. *quæst.* 1. *cap.* 28. that the Scripture is *unica credendi & vivendi regula,* the only Rule of Faith and Life.

These

These things being ſo clear, I will now examine the Objections of the Pamphleter, which if they conclude any thing, make as ſtrongly againſt themſelves, or any Rule of Faith they can pretend to, yea ſerve as well to prove that the *Scriptures* are no ground of Faith at all, as that they are not a ground of the Religion of Proteſtants. In truth they are Cavils more beſeeming an Atheiſt that would overturn all Religion, than a Chriſtian; yet leaſt he ſhould ſay his Arguments were not anſwered, I ſhall take them to conſideration.

SECT. III.

The Pamphleters four principal Objections againſt the Scriptures being the compleat Rule of Faith, diſcuſſed.

OBjection firſt, He enquires, *pag.* 50. *whether I make the Scriptures, as tranſlated, or as in the Original Tongues, the Rule of Faith, and ground of our Religion. Not as tranſlated, becauſe* Chamier lib. 1. cap. 2. Sect. 15. D. Featly, *whom he calls* D. Daniel *in his Treatiſe, the Dippers dipped,* pag. 1. *and* D. Barron, tract. 1. cap. 2. pag. 46. *ſay that Tranſlations only are Authentick, in ſo far as they agree with Originals. Now thoſe Original Tongues of* Hebrew, Greek, *and* Syriack, *not one of a thouſand underſtand: And further,* ſaith he, *our Tranſlations are cenſured by Proteſtants:* Zuinglius *accuſes* Luthers *Verſion of Errours;* Luther *himſelf confeſſes that he puts in the word* ſola *in the Text, which was not in the Original:* Car. Molinæus *ſays* Calvin *in his Harmony, makes the Text trip up and down,* Caſtalio *accuſes* Beza's *Tranſlation of many errours,* M. Parkes *taxes the* Geneva *Tranſlation of many errours, and ſo doth* M. Burges, *and* Hugh Broughton, *our Engliſh Verſion; yea* Broughton *ſays, that it cauſes millions of Souls to run to eternal flames, and in the Verſions made under Q.* Elizabeth, *and K.* James, *there be many diverſities; ſometimes that put in the Text which was in the Margin, and that in the Margin which was in the Text.*

To this firſt Atheiſtical invective againſt the holy Scriptures, which for moſt part is ſtoln from *Breerly, Apol. tract.* 1. *Sect.* 10. *ſubdiviſ.* 4. and *tract.* 2. *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 10. *ſubdiviſ.* 2. I anſwer firſt by retortion. This Objection militates as ſtrongly againſt Romaniſts, as againſt us: For after the ſame manner it may be enquired, whether the definitions of their Church, or infallible viſible Judge, namely, the Decre-

tals of Popes, and Canons of Councils, be the ground of their Faith and Religion in the Languages wherein they were first given out, *viz.* in Greek, or Latin, or as Translated? Not as Translated, because the Translations are not Authentical, but in so far as they agree with the Principals, and the Principals by many are not understood: But besides, what assurance can they have that those Originals are not corrupted in the conveyance by fallible men? Have not Learned Criticks discovered, that many suppositititious Decretals, and Canons of Councils, are obtruded on the Christian world by Romanists? Hath not *Isidore Clarius*, a Popish Writer, noted as many Errours in the Vulgar Latin Version, as any of those, mentioned in the Objection, have alledged in the Versions of Protestants? consequently Romanists themselves must confess this Argument of the Pamphleter to be a Sophism, seeing it overturns also the ground of their Religion: Nay, the same Cavil might have been moved against the Ancient Christian Church, for in her also there were many who understood not the Hebrew Text; yea, some of the Fathers had little understanding of that Language; then also there were innumerable Latin Translations, made by fallible persons, witness *Austin, lib. 2. de doct. Christi. cap.* 10. & 11. though he do prefer *cap.* 15. the Italian Translation to the rest; yet so far was the Ancient Church from esteeming it perfect, that *Hierom* judged it needful to make a new Translation of the Old Testament out of the Hebrew, as himself reports, *lib. de viris illustribus cap. ult.* and to correct the errours of the Vulgar Version of the New Testament out of the Greek; which work he undertook and performed, at the request of *Damasus* Bishop of *Rome*, as appears by *Hierom, Epist.* 123. *Præfat. ad Evang. ad Damas.* and by *Cassiod Instit. lib.* 1. *cap.* 12. Doth not the Pamphleter behave himself like an Atheist, seeing his Objections against us militate against Christianity it self? Is not this a strong demonstration, that our Religion is the true Christian Religion, that the Arguments of Papists against us are the Cavils which Infidels might use against Christianity it self?

Secondly, Therefore leaving retorsion, I answer absolutely, that Scripture, both in the Originals, and when faithfully translated, is the Rule of Faith. If an Ambassadour deliver his mind by an Interpreter, are not the words of the Interpreter the words of the Ambassadour? Was not the Faith of the *Ephesians* built upon the Foundation of the Prophets and Apostles? *Ephes.* 2. 20. But it cannot be supposed with any probability, that all the *Ephesians* did understand the

the Originals of the Prophets writings, for they were not Jews; therefore surely their Faith has been built on translated Scripture: Neither can Christs Command of searching the Scriptures, *Joh.* 5 39. be restricted to the Originals only, seeing himself, and the Apostles, did frequently cite the Scriptures according to the Version of the 70. Neither say *Chamier*, *Featly*, or D. *Barron*, any thing contrary to this, for they only deny Versions to be the Rule of Faith, in so far as they disagree from the Originals; yea, then to speak properly, they are not Translations at all: I notice not much the wrong Citation of *Chamier*, in whose *lib.* 1. *cap.* 2. there is not a *Sect.* 15. for the Pamphleter shews himself to be as implicite in his Citations, as in his Faith.

Only it may be replied, *How can illiterate persons resolve their Faith upon a translated Bible, seeing they cannot examine its conformity or disconformity with the Original, they being ignorant of the Language?* But it may as easily be retorted, How can an illiterate man resolve his Faith upon the definition of the Council of *Trent*, or upon the *Doway* or *Rhemist* Translations, or upon a Bull or Decretal of the Pope, seeing he cannot examine if these be faithfully translated from the Latin? What answer Romanists give, we can give the same. Had not the Pamphleter been disposed to quarrel, he might have found this difficulty copiously cleared in that *Cap.* of D. *Barrons Apodex.* which himself cited, *viz. tract.* 1 *cap.* 2. Shortly then, for satisfaction of the Reader, I answer, that a person unskilled in the Original Language, may not only have a humane moral certainty of the conformity of his English Bible with the Original, upon the testimony of a Protestant Church, and Learned Pastors, but also as *Camero* in his excellent *tractat. de notis quibus verbum Dei in specie dignoscitur Not.* 3. observes, there is a special Divine Character in the Scriptures, which is not to be restricted to the Original Languages, but individually inherent to the Doctrine of Scripture in whatsoever Language, if it be faithfully translated, which the Author doth there copiously illustrate. Among other things, he uses this example, *pag.* 32. Some of *Averroes* writings are translated into very barbarous Latin, yet there is no judicious Reader (saith he) but will discern *Averroes* to have been a most Eloquent man, the Tropes, Figures, and Metaphors, being kept in the Version. He compares a faithful Translation to a Picture drawn with Ink, by which we may discern the lineaments and comelines of the person represented thereby, though not the colour. So albeit there be some things acci-

dental in the Original Language which a Tranſlation cannot expreſs, yet ſtill there is as much as may manifeſt the Divine Original of the Scriptures. For further ſatisfaction in this thing, I ſhall commend to the ſincere Lover of Truth, the peruſal both of that Tractate of *Camero*, and of an excellent little Treatiſe of D. *Owen*, of the Divine Original, Authority, and ſelf-evidencing light and power of the Scriptures. Neither ought it ſeem ſtrange to any, that there ſhould be ſuch a ſelf-evidencing light in the Doctrines of ſalvation contained in holy Scripture, yea, there is a kind of neceſſity it muſt be ſo, conſidering the poſture of humane affairs. For ſeeing the World is divided into ſo many various Languages, whether the Lord thought fit to reveal the Doctrine of ſalvation by a written Inſtrument, ſuch as the Scriptures, or by the definition of a viſible Judge, as Papiſts pretend, yet it behoved to be delivered in ſome one Language; and ſeeing thoſe Truths were, by the confeſſion of both Parties, to be conveyed to others of different Languages, by the means of fallible perſons, either there behoved to be an intrinſick evidence in the Doctrine, to ſhew that it came from God, which we affirm, or the moſt part of the world ſhould only have a moral and humane certainty of thoſe Myſteries of ſalvation, which the plurality, both of Papiſts and Proteſtants, do judge inſufficient to ſalvation. It's no Phanatical Enthuſiaſm therefore to ſay, that ſouls enlightned by the Spirit of God, without the knowledge of Greek or Hebrew Languages, in a faithfully tranſlated Bible, may ſee the wonders of Gods Law. I ſay no more than *Caſſiod. Inſtit. lib. 1. cap. 16. Quid in illis literis utilitatis & ſuavitatis non invenies, ſi purißimo lumine mentis intendis*; *i. e.* What ſpiritual utility or ſuavity will not be found in theſe divine writings, if thou look on them with a pure eye? Neither doth he reſtrict this to the Original Languages; and therefore *cap.* 21. ſpeaking of *Hierom*, *Beatus Hieronymus*, ſaith he, *Latinæ Linguæ dilatator exiſtit, qui nobis in Tranſlatione Divinæ Scripturæ tantum præſtitit, ut ad Hebræum fontem pæne non egeamus accedere.* He ſo highly commends *Hieroms* Tranſlation of Scripture, as if there were not much more need of the Original; and therefore ſuppoſes that tranſlated Scripture could be a ground of Faith. Learned *Hornbeck Part.* 1. *Theol. practi. lib.* 1. *cap.* 3. records many inſtances of holy perſons, both Ancient and Modern, who felt a divine convincing and converting power in the Scriptures, ſuch as is not to be found in any other writing: What ſerious Chriſtian can but acknowledge, that there is a ſtupendious Majeſty yet tempered with

an

an admirable ſweet condiſcention in the Scriptures? Though there be ſublime Myſteries in holy Writ, which Natural Reaſon could never have diſcovered, yet all of them are wonderfully ſuited for carrying on the work of a ſinners ſalvation, the like whereof is not to be found in any other Religion whatſoever: Whereupon Learned Divines do conclude, that in the Complex of the Principal, or Fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity, is an intrinſick evidence of their Divine Original. And concerning the ſtile of holy Scripture, *Camero* hath an excellent expreſſion, *Tom.* 3. *pag.* 138. *Eſt divinum aliquid in Scripturæ ſtilo quod effari non poſſum, perſentiſcitur tamen*; i. e. there is ſome divine thing in the ſtile of holy Scripture which I cannot expreſs; yet it is felt which he illuſtrates by this *ſimile*, when an Angel appears, though he aſſume an humane ſhape, there is ever ſomething peculiar in the Apparition, which ſtrikes the mind of the Beholder with an apprehenſion of ſomewhat extraordinary: Is it then any wonder there be ſomething peculiar in the Scriptures of God, to demonſtrate their Divine Original? Though I ſpeak for the ſelf-evidencing light of holy Scripture, I do acknowledge the great uſefulneſs of the Motives of Credibility in their own place, for they prepare the mind for diſcerning this Divine Light reſplendent in the Scriptures.

If this do not ſatisfie pertinacious Romaniſts, they may at laſt conſider what their Learned Cardinal *de Lugo* hath ſaid, *diſp.* 1. *de fide Sect.* 7, 8. where he maintains, at length, againſt his Fellow-Jeſuits, that the firſt aſſent given by Chriſtians to Scriptural Revelation is immediate, and not founded upon any Prior objective ground. Indeed he calls it obſcure and inevident, but withal infallible, moſt certain, and immediate, yea, he particularly denies it to be founded on the teſtimony of the Church, Miracles, or conſtancy of Martyrs, *&c.* only he affirms, that a man comparing Scriptural Revelation accompanied with ſuch Miracles, the death of Martyrs, the approbation of ſo many judicious Doctors, *&c.* with the Idea which he hath in his mind of a Divine Revelation, finds ſuch a conſonancy betwixt them, that without any diſcurſive inference, he immediately aſſents to that Revelation as Divine; which the ſaid Author illuſtrates by this ſimilitude, as when, ſaith he, a man receives a Letter from his Friend, or hears him ſpeak at a diſtance, he compares the Characters of the Letter, and the Voice which he hears, with the Idea which he hath in his mind of his Friends Writing or Voice; and ſo, without any argumentation, concludes this is his

Friends

Friends Writ, or Voice, and such he supposes to be our first assent to Divine Revelation. This Notion of the Cardinal, for which he disputes with much Learning and acuteness, quite overturns the whimsies of the Pamphleting Missionaries, who would have the first assent to Scriptural Revelation, to be grounded on the testimony of the Church, or definition of their infallible Judge.

As for the Clamours of the Adversary, *that the Protestants mentioned in the Objection, have charged the Translations of one another with Errours and Discrepancies.* Ought he not to remember, that there be as great variety and contrariety betwixt the Versions made by Popish Authors, such as *Lyranus Paulus Brugensis*, *Valla*, *Cajetan*, *Erasmus*, *Pagnin*, *Arrias*, *Montanus*, *&c.* Had those imagined a perfection in the Vulgar Latin, would they have dissented from it so often? Do not *Vega*, *Andradius*, *Driedo*, *Mariana* affirm, that the Council of *Trent*, when it declared the Vulgar Latin to be Authentical Scripture, never intended to assert its freedom from Errour? Doth not *Isidore Clarius*, a Popish Bishop aver, that he has amended 8000 places in the Vulgar Latin, and yet left many to be corrected; yea, so many were the Errours of the *Clementine* Translation, that one spared not to call it the *New Transgression*.

But forbearing to recriminate, I answer first, Had not this Pamphleter resolved to abuse his Reader, by often-confuted Cavils, he might have learned from our Authors, that those Censures, for most part, are rather the superfœtation of over-reaching passion, than a rational and composed Verdict of our Translations. Might he not have found how the Learned and Modest *Rivet* in *Isagog. ad Scripturam Sac. cap.* 12. doth chastise both *Castalio*, and *Hugh Broughton*, for their Petulancy, upon more Judicious Translators than themselves? May not *Joseph Scaligers* testimony of *Beza's* Translation preponderate *Castalio's* Censure?

In quibus & fœtus supra caput extulit omnes
Ille tuorum operum summa caputq; liber
Quo penetrale novi reserratur fœderis & quo
Discussa lucem nocte videre datur.

When the passage of *Hugh Broughton*, alledged by the Pamphleter, had been objected by *F. Johnson* to D. *Shirman*, the Doctor in his Reply, *pag.* 962. spares not to call him passionate *Hugh*; and withal shews, that the main thing which offended *Broughton* at our Translation, was something concerning the question of the descent of the Soul of Christ to Hell. I cannot examine whether *Zuinglius* be

be faithfully cited, not having his Works: But though *Gerard* the *Lutheran*, *in uberiori exegeſ. loc. de ſcript. cap.* 29. *Sect.* 122. gives an account of other of our Authors not ſo well ſatisfied with *Luthers* German Tranſlation, yet he has no word of *Zuinglius*: However, they who know the animoſities which the Sacramentarian Controverſie did breed, will not think ſtrange, though *Zuinglius* and *Luther* uſed more aſperity in Cenſuring the Works of one another than was fitting. The Cenſure of *Carolus Molinæus* is not much to be regarded, he being no Divine, but an unſetled, though Learned Lawyer, firſt a Papiſt, then a Proteſtant, and afterwards with the Dog returning to his Vomit, and re-imbracing Popery, he breathed forth invectives againſt worthy men, as is uſual with Apoſtates to be haters of their own Sect. This is teſtified of him by *Lucas Oſiander*, *Epitom. Hiſt. Eccleſ. cent.* 16. *Anno* 1566. *pag.* 802. As for the acknowledgment of *Luther*, that he added the word *Sola*, you may take the Anſwer of *Gerard* the Lutheran, *loc. cit. Sect.* 525. *Non verba numeravit, ſenſum exprimere voluit.* And indeed, though I would have Tranſlators to be punctual in their Verſion of Scripture, yet it's a ſure truth, that we are juſtified by Faith alone, or as the Apoſtle ſaith, *by Faith, without the works of the Law.* But leaving further to canvaſe thoſe unadviſed expreſſions of ſome Proteſtants Authors, which are nothing *ad ſumma in rei*, I can preſs Romaniſts with contrary Verdicts of Popes concerning the Vulgar Latin, *Sixtus Quintus*, and *Clement* the 8. All they can object to us, are but ſome raſh expreſſions of private men, who can pretend to no Authority.

Secondly, Therefore I anſwer, that we ought carefully to diſtinguiſh betwixt ſmaller Grammatical Eſcapes, and ſubſtantial Errours, overturning Articles of Faith. It's not denied, but the firſt may be incident to any Verſion made by humane induſtry: but I appeal all the Romiſh Party, to try if they can charge the Engliſh Tranſlation, which is made uſe of in this Church, with any ſubſtantial Errour and Article of Faith; that had been the moſt ſolid way of arguing againſt us. As for *the diverſities betwixt the Engliſh Tranſlation under Q.* Elizabeth, *and K.* James 6. I ſuppoſe it will be found, that both the reading laid aſide, and that which is ſubſtituted, are conform to the Analogy of Faith, though the one may be more agreeable to the Original and Series of the Context, and ſo is preferrable to the other; by which the ingenuity of Proteſtant Churches may appear, they being willing to correct the leaſt failure.

It

It were eaſie to demonſtrate, that the Papiſts vulgar-Verſion is often guilty of ill Latin, and worſe Divinity: Who deſire an account of the varieties, contradictions, errours, and barbariſms of the Vulgar Latin, I refer them to D. *James bellum Papale*, *Calov. Crit. Sac. de Verſ. Vulg.* *Chamier Panſtrat. Tom.* 1. *lib.* 14. *cap.* 11, 12, 13. and to *Sixtinus Amama*, in *Anti barbara Biblic. lib.* 1. *cap.* 9, 10, 11. who alſo ſhews, *cap.* 12, 13. that Jeſuit *Serrarius*, *Bellarmine*, *Baptiſta Baudinus*, the Reviſer of the *Vatican* Preſs, *Lucas Brugenſis*, yea, and the Prefacer to the *Clementine* Verſion, do acknowledge that the Latin Verſion, as laſtly corrected by *Clement* 8. hath yet its own treſpaſſes, and deſerves further emendation. But this is the miſchief of *Rome*'s pretended Infallibility, that ſhe will rather juſtly know faults; than by amending them, humbly confeſs her ſelf fallible. In a word, except Romaniſts can prove that in our Tranſlations there be ſuch Errours, as deſtroy the ſubſtantials of Chriſtianity, (which though the Conclaves of *Rome* and Hell do joyn forces, cannot be done) it cannot be concluded that our Bibles are not a ſufficient Ground and Rule of Faith.

To ſhut up the Anſwer to this Objection, *Richard Cappell* in his Remains, *pag.* 30, 31. preſents this Notion to the conſideration of the Godly Learned, that ſeeing the Lord hath commanded his people to hear, read and ſearch the Scriptures, which the multitude cannot do but in ſome Tranſlation or other, and God being in his Providence very careful that his Church ſhall not want ſufficient proviſion for their Souls, therefore he, the ſaid M. *Cappell*, ſuppoſes, that God ever hath, doth, and will ſo aſſiſt Tranſlators, that, for the main, they ſhall not err. And indeed, though the Vulgar Latin be but too faulty, as I have already ſhewed, yet we deny not, but it is a Bible, and contains the ſubſtantials of Religion: Neither have I any doubt, but many have been converted by it; ſuch as *Peter Martyr*, *Zanchius*, *Luther*, *Oecolampadius*, *&c.* I am not to adopt M. *Cappell*'s Notion, yet ſhould it hold, far leſs could there be ground to Cavil againſt our Tranſlations, as not being a ſufficient ground of Faith, they being much more pure and agreeable to the Originals than the Vulgar Latin, as cannot but be clear to thoſe who have any meaſure of skill to compare them.

Objection 2. The Pamphleter, *pag.* 54, 55, 56. *accuſes the Original Texts of Scripture as corrupted; in confirmation whereof he alledges, that it's doubted, in what Language ſome parts of Scripture were written; that* Calvin *and* Luther *queſtioned the purity of the Originals;*

that

that there be various Lections in the Hebrew; that the Jews, Christs profeſſed Enemies, five hundred years after Chriſt, invented the Hebrew Points, or Vowels, and corrupted the Text, but that before this corruption their Vulgar Latin was made; that Hereticks alſo, particularly Arrians, Macedonians, Neſtorians, &c. *had their hand in adulterating Scripture, for which he alledges* Irenæus, Tertull. *and* Euſebius, but cites no place in any of them, *that we have not the Autographies written by Prophets or Apoſtles, and all Copies are ſubject to faults.* In the end he concludes, *that there is no remedy for theſe evils, without an infallible viſible Judge.*

In all this he doth ſtill behave himſelf like an Atheiſt. Doth he not by concluding the Original Scriptures to be all corrupted, raze with one ſtroak the Foundation of the Chriſtian Religion? Is not this a pregnant evidence of the impiety of the Romiſh Intereſt, and truth of the Proteſtant Religion, that Romaniſts cannot fight againſt us, but with the Weapons of Infidels? for ſupporting their *Babel*, they will venture the ruine of all Religion, *ridente Turca, nec dolente Judæo.*

For anſwer therefore to this Blaſphemous Cavil, let firſt the Pamphleters inconſiſtency with himſelf be noticed. In his *former Section he brought Scriptures* to prove the neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge; yet here he affirms, *we cannot know a line of pure Scripture, that is not vitiated, but by the ſentence of this infallible Judge.* Is not this to intangle himſelf into a manifeſt Circle, or contradiction? Secondly, Was this man *compos mentis*, when he brings in *Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen*, and *Euſebius, teſtifying that the Scriptures were corrupted by Arrians, Macedonians, and Neſtorians*; whereas theſe Hereſies were not broached in the times of moſt of thoſe Authors? Yea further he affirms, *that the Vulgar Latin Verſion was made before the Scriptures were corrupted*; where he inſinuates, that the Bible was not corrupted till after *Hierom*'s time (*Hierom* being the Author of the greater part, at leaſt, of the Vulgar Latin, by the acknowledgment of moſt Judicious Romaniſts, as is ſhewed by *Ludov. de Tena, Iſagog. ad ſcript. lib.* 1. *diff.* 6. *Sect.* 2.) How then could *Irenæus, Tertull. Origen*, and *Euſebius*, teſtifie of the corruption of Scripture, ſeeing all thoſe were dead before the time wherein *Hierom* did flouriſh. It's juſt with God, that they who oppugne the Scriptures, ſhould not underſtand their own ſelves.

I anſwer ſecondly by retorſion: Is there not more cauſe to queſtion the Originals of that which they make the Rule of Faith, I mean

of Decretals of Popes, and Canons of Councils; how many ſuppoſititious Decretals have they obtruded, as of *Clemens*, *Anacletus*, *Euariſtus*, *Alex. Sixtus*, *Teleſphorus*, &c. which though *Gratian diſt.* 19. *cap. in Canonicis* ſays, that they ſhould be reckoned *inter Canonicas Scripturas*, yet our Learned Criticks have proved them to be ſuppoſititious, as *Cocus in Cenſura Scriptorum veterum*, *pag.* 20. to 24. *Rivet in Crit. Sac. lib.* 1. *cap.* 8. and others. Yea, is not the Faith of the Canons and Conſtitutions paſſing under the names of the Apoſtles, juſtly queſtioned; as may be ſeen in the ſame *Cocus*, *pag.* 3. and 15. *Rivet Crit. Sac. lib.* 1. *cap* 2.4. and *Dallæus de Pſeudepigraphis*, how many ſuppoſititious Canons of Councils have Romaniſts obtruded? Were not Popes of *Rome*, long ago, convicted by the *African* Fathers, of pretending a ſuppoſititious Canon of the Council of *Nice* for Appeals to *Rome*: yea, do they do not daily obtrude the definitions of the Conventicles at *Florence*, and *Trent*, as definitions of Oecumenick Councils; whereas it hath been often demonſtrated, that theſe Councils were neither free, nor Oecumeniek. If the Tranſcribers of the Scriptures be obnoxious to miſtakes, how can the Tranſcribers of the Canons of Councils be infallible? If tranſcribing of Bibles be obnoxious to errours, is not the conveyance of Oral Traditions liable to as many, nay to more miſtakes? Is it not more eaſie to guard againſt vitiating of written Books, then the unfaithful conveyance of Tradition? Are not Hereticks, and men of unſound minds, as much inclined to vitiate Traditions, as the written Word? By theſe it may appear, that this Weapon of the Romaniſt wounds himſelf as much as us.

I anſwer thirdly: It's a blaſphemous falſhood to ſay the Scriptures, in their Original, are corrupted. Hath God promiſed, *Mat.* 5. 18. *that one jot, or one tittle, ſhall not paſs from the Law*, and yet hath he ſuffered the whole Original Scriptures, which were given by the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt, to be corrupted? I will not here enquire, whether our Saviour meant by the κέρα κεραία one tittle: The Hebrew Vowels and Accents, as *Piſcator* conceives, or ſtroaks in the head of the Letters, like horns, which the Jews uſed in thoſe Copies of the Bible which were kept in Synagogues, as *Capellus de punct. Antiq. lib* 2. *cap.* 14. affirms, or whether a part of a Letter, as *Lud. de Dieu*, and Jeſuit *Maldonat* on the place ſuppoſe, or whether κέρα and κεραία are to be taken as terms Synonimous, as they are ſaid to be by the Ethiopick Interpreter: only it appears by the Series of the context, that Chriſt underſtood ſome of the leaſt things

things belonging to the integrity of the written Law If Divine Providence be ſo careful to preſerve the leaſt of theſe, ſhall we imagine the whole Body of the Original Scriptures to be vitiated? Hath the whole Catholick Church been ſo unfaithful, to ſuffer ſuch a precious *depoſitum* as the Original Scriptures to be loſt? Do not Romaniſts ſay, that we have received the Original Scriptures in Hebrew, and Greek, from them? Hath the Roman Church cheated us in this, to give us vitiated Tranſcripts in place of the Originals? ſhould we then believe her fidelity or infallibility in other things? if the whole Original Scriptures are corrupted, I pray by whom, or when was it done? ſurely not by Jews, as is proved by *Jerom* in *Cap.* 6. of *Iſai.* where alſo he cites *Origen* for the ſame thing: with them accords *Auſtin*, *lib.* 15. *de civ. Dei*, *cap.* 13. for either they corrupted them before the coming of Chriſt, or after: if before, how is it that they were never reproved for ſo heynous a treſpaſs by Chriſt, or his Diſciples? He condemns them for corrupt gloſſes put on Scripture, but never for vitiating the Letter of Scripture: Nay, does he not command his hearers to ſearch the Scriptures, *Joh.* 5. 39. Does he not ſtill Appeal to Scripture for deciſion of all Controverſies? Would he ever have remitted them thereto, had he known them generally to be corrupted? if after Chriſt, how then comes it that the teſtimonies of the Old Teſtament, cited by Chriſt and the Apoſtles, are to this day found in the Originals? did Chriſt, and the Apoſtles, cite them as they were to be vitiated by the Jews? if Jews had corrupted Scriptures, would they not have chiefly corrupted thoſe which ſpake of the *Meſſias*, but thoſe remain entire to this day, yea as *Bell.* acknowledges, *lib.* 2. *de verb. Dei*, *cap.* 2. The Hebrew Text affords more clear and pregnant teſtimonies for the *Meſſias*, than either the Greek of the 70, or the Vulgar Latin, and produces inſtances to this purpoſe, as *Pſal.* 2. where the Hebrew hath it, *Kiſs the Son*; the 70, and the Vulgar Latin have, *Appræhendite diſciplinam*: *Joannes Iſaac*, a Popiſh Author, ſpares not to affirm, as he is cited by *Calv. de puritate fontium*, *Sect.* 93. *pag.* 414. *ducenta & amplius argumenta quæ Judaicas impietates refellunt in Hebraico textu quam in Latino planius contineri*; *i. e.* that the Hebrew Text affords 200 Arguments, and upward, againſt Jewiſh impieties, more clearly than the Vulgar Latin: How Religiouſly, yea ſuperſtitiouſly careful have the Jews been of the Scriptures, both of old, and to this day? Doth not *Euſebius*, *lib.* 8. *de præpar. Evangel. cap.* 6. out of *Philo de Judæorum ex Ægypto profectione*, teſtifie, that to his time not one word

was altered in the Original. If the Bible do but casually fall to the ground, do they not endite a solemn Fast? Have they not numbred all the words and Letters in the Bible, so that a Letter cannot be lost without observation? How putid is the Calumny of *Gordon* of *Huntly*, *controv.* 1. *de verb. Dei*, *cap* 9. that this diligence of the Jews is only to perpetuate the corruption of the Hebrew Text made by the *Masorites*, for which he is sufficiently chastised by *Palovius*? Had the *Masorites* so corrupted the Bible, would it not have been observed by the *Karaits*, who because in all things they adhered to the Scriptures, are hated by the Traditionary Jews more than Christians? At least, how could it have escaped the observation of Christians? Were there not Hebrew Bibles in the custody of Christian Churches? How could Jews corrupt all these? Is not this Cavil of the general corruption of the Original Scriptures so impious, that many Learned Romanists have appeared against it; such as *Joannes Isaacus*, Professor of the Hebrew Language at *Colen*, in his Book entituled, *Defensio veritatis Hebraicæ Sacrarum Scripturarum adversus Lindanum*, *Ludovicus Vives in lib.* 15. *August. de civ. Dei*, *Arrias Montanus in Præfat. ad Bibl. interlin. Sixtus Senensis lib.* 8. *Biblioth. Sanct. Hæres.* 2. where he expresly says, *Dici non potest divinas scripturas veteris Testamenti aut Judæorum aut Christianorum malignitate falsificatas*; yea, he reckons the contrary Opinion as a pestilent Errour and Heresie: Not to mention *Pagnin*, *Vatablus*, *Mercus*, *Marinus*, besides many others cited and followed by *Lud. de Tena*, *Isagog. Sac. Script. lib.* 1. *diff.* 3. *Sect.* 2, 3. *Bellarmine* himself, *lib.* 2. *de verb. Dei*, *cap.* 2. charged *Jacobus Chrysipolitanus*, and *Melchior Canus*, for maintaining, as this Pamphleter does, that the Jews had corrupted many things in the Original Bible, as men not having knowledge proportioned to their zeal: However *Bell.* affirm, that some few places in the Hebrew be corrupted (wherein also Learned Protestants have laboured to shew his mistake) yet he concludes, *Cæterum non tanti momenti sunt ejusmodi errores ut in iis quæ ad fidem & bonos mores pertinent Scripturæ Sacræ integritas desideretur.* They who would see the purity of Original Scriptures asserted at length against Romanists, I remit them to *Chamier Panstrat. Tom.* 1. *lib.* 12. *Rivet in Isagog. ad sac. script. cap.* 8. *Gerard in uberiori explicatione loc. de scriptura cap.* 12. *Calov. Crit. sac. de puritate fontium*, *Sect.* 93. where the last Author musters up seventeen Arguments for the purity of them; to which only I add D. *Owens* Judicious Tractate of the integrity and purity of the Hebrew and Greek Text of Scripture.

But

But againſt this, it is firſt alledged by the Pamphleter, *that it's doubted in what Language ſome parts of Scripture were written.* Anſwer, Some queſtion indeed hath been made concerning the Language wherein the Goſpels of *Mat.* and *Mark*, and the Epiſtle to the *Heb.* were written, but of none elſe. I confeſs Ancients generally have ſuppoſed that *Matth.* Goſpel was firſt written in *Hebrew*, not only *Jerom Præfat. Evang. ad Damaſ. Epiſt.* 123. but alſo *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Euſebius*, *Athanaſius*, *Epiphan. Chryſ. Auguſt. &c.* yet this their Opinion ſeems to have been founded upon the Tradition of *Papias*, a man of more Antiquity than Judgment, ſays *Euſeb. lib.* 3. *Hiſt. Eccleſ. cap. ult.* And there are Eminently Learned men of Opinion, that it was firſt written in Greek, with whom Cardinal *Cajetan* does joyn; neither are the Arguments contemptible by which they are thereunto induced. But however, even thoſe who maintain that *Matthews* Goſpel was written in *Hebrew*, do yet acknowledge that it was tranſlated into Greek, by a perſon infallibly inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, ſome by *John* the Apoſtle, ſome by *James*, and generally others, by an Apoſtle, or Apoſtolick perſon; and that the Goſpel of *Matthew*, in the Greek, was always uſed in the Chriſtian Primitive Church as Authentick. *Barradius* the Jeſuit (as is teſtified by *Lud. de Tena in Iſagog. lib.* 3. *diff.* 2. *Sect.* 1.) thinks that *Matthew* himſelf wrote this Goſpel both in Hebrew and Greek. I know *Baronius* prefers the Authority of *Matthew* in Hebrew to the Greek, *Dico* (ſaith he) *quod Græcus textus cujus fidei ſit niſi eſſatus eum Hebræo originali affirmare minime poſſumus*; but learnedly is that impious errour of the Cardinal confuted by *Caſaubon in apparat. exercit.* 16. *cap.* 115. *pag.* 678. The like, I ſay, as to *the Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, that many have judged that it alſo was written in the Hebrew Tongue, yet there be not only Learned Proteſtants, but alſo Romaniſts in the contrary Opinion: The Apoſtles Argument, *cap.* 9. from the nature of a Teſtament, is a ſtrong preſumption that it was written in the Greek, the Argument concluding forcibly from the Greek word διαθηκη, not ſo from the Hebrew *Berith*; yet it's alſo agreed, that at leaſt it was tranſcribed into the Greek Tongue by an Apoſtolick perſon: whether *Luke*, or *Clement*, I am not to diſpute. As for *Mark*, it's true, *Baronius* and *Bellarmine* affirm it was firſt written in Latin; if ſo, how then was the Latin Church ſo unfaithful, as to loſe that Original Latin written by *Mark*, that being the only Book in Scripture that can be alledged to have been written in Latin? For the preſent Latin Verſion of the Goſpel of

Mark

Mark is ſurely tranſlated from the Greek, as *Cornel. à Lapide* in his Preface to his Comment on that Goſpel does not only confeſs, but demonſtrate by ſeveral paſſages of *Mark*'s Goſpel. That fancy of *Baronius*, as if *Mark*'s Goſpel had been firſt written in Latin, is expreſly contradicted by *Jerom Præfat. Evang. Auſtin lib.* 1. *concordia Evangeliſt.* and *Iſidore Hiſpal. Præfat. lib. Teſt. Novi.* who affirm that all the Evangels, except that of *Matthew*, were firſt written in Greek, yea, the Cardinal is ſolidly confuted by a Popiſh Biſhop, *Lud. de Tena Iſagog. lib.* 3. *diff.* 6. *Sect.* 2. who ſays its *certum apud omnes*, that *Mark*'s Goſpel was written in Greek. What need I more as to this, ſeeing *Bell. lib.* 2. *de verb. Dei cap.* 7. confeſſes, *Quod Græca editio Novi Teſtamenti univerſa Apoſtolos & Evangeliſtas Authores habeat*, ſince therefore we have the Greek Edition of all the Books of the New Teſtament, we have the Scriptures in thoſe Languages, wherein holy men infallibly inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt did write them.

The ſecond allegation of the Pamphleter is, *that* Calvin *and* Luther *do ſometimes call in queſtion the purity of the Originals.* What then? Are *Calvin* or *Luther* with us infallible Judges of Articles of Faith, as Jeſuits make the Pope? May not this allegation be compenſed, in regard Eminent Popiſh Authors aſſerted the purity of the Originals? I have looked that place of *Calvin*, *lib.* 1. *Inſtit. cap.* 13. *cited by this Pamphleter*, and can aſſert, that *Calvin* has nothing to that purpoſe throughout all that *Cap.* for in it he only diſputes concerning the Trinity? Nay, I find the very contrary in that Book, *cap.* 8. *Sect.* 10. yea, and *Bell. lib.* 2. *de verb. Dei cap.* 2. cenſures *Calvin* as preferring too great purity to the Hebrew Text, and calling it *Puriſſimum Fontem*. *Luther* likewiſe, and his Followers, as *Chemnitius*, *Gerard*, *Calovius*, *&c.* are moſt zealous Aſſertors of the purity of the Originals. If any thing, any where, have dropt from thoſe men derogating from the purity of Originals, it would but argue a piece of humane frailty in them, and of as groſs inconſiſtencies, I can convict both Cardinals and Popes.

It is alledged thirdly, *that there be to the number of* 800 *various Lections in the Hebrew Text*: if he ſpeak of the *Keri* and *Kethib*, according to which one word is written in the Line, and another in the Margin, the Vowels whereof are attributed to the word in the Line, this can be of no advantage to him, unleſs he could make out, that theſe various Lections were introduced ſince *Jerom*'s time. But all the Hebrew Doctors, ſaith the Learned *Buxtorf Antitrit.*

Part. 2. *cap.* 4. affirm them to be of no latter date than the days of *Ezra*. I know *Lud. Capell, Crit. ſac. lib.* 3. *cap.* 15. maintains them to be introduced by the *Poſt-Talmudique Maſorites* after *Hierom*: But *Buxtorf loc. cit.* is at great pains to confute them. And among other reaſons, he uſeth this as one to prove the great Antiquity of theſe various Lections, that not only the *Chaldee* Paraphraſts, but alſo becauſe the *Septuagints* in their Verſion ſometime follow the *Keri*, rendring according to the word in the Margin. Indeed *Buxtorf* doth not affirm all the various Lections, which go under the name of *Keri*, to be of equal Antiquity; but that Learned Author lays down Rules how the latter may be diſcerned from the more Ancient. For anſwer therefore, I ſhall remit this Pamphleter to *Bell. lib.* 2. *de verb Dei cap.* 2. who ſays, that *tota diſcrepantia variarum Lectionum in dictionibus quibuſdam poſita eſt, quæ ſenſum aut parum aut nihil mutant*; or if he will take it in the words of Learned D. *Owen*, in his Tractate of the integrity and purity of the Hebrew and Greek Text of Scripture, *cap.* 6. *Sect.* 4. The difference in the ſenſe, taking in the whole Context, is, upon the matter, very little, or none at all; at leaſt each word, both that in the Line, and that in the Margin, yield a ſenſe agreeable to the Analogy of Faith, which that Judicious Author illuſtrates by examples, where there would appear the greateſt diſſonancy; whether, as ſome Hebrew Doctors conceives, the Scripture was at firſt delivered with that variety of reading, or as others rather judge, that they came from the men of the great Congregation, *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, *Zecbary*, *Haggai*, all perſons acted by Divine Inſpiration, they argue no depravation in the Original. Hence it is, that in our laſt Tranſlation of the Bible, the word in the Margin is often uſed; yet ſo, as that the word in the Line is alſo noted, where there appears any conſiderable difference, which the Tranſlators would not have done (as D. *Owen* Judiciouſly obſerves) had they not conceived, that both the word in the Margin, and in the Line, had an Authoritative Original, beyond the impeachment of any man in theſe days.

The Pamphleter fourthly alledges *the differenees of reading by Rabbi* Jacob, *and Rabbi* Aaron, *and their reſpective Followers.* Theſe appear to be the differences betwixt the two Famed Rabbins *Ben-Aſher*, and *Ben. Naphtali:* For *Cappellus* in his *Critica Sac. lib.* 3. *cap.* 18. *Sect.* 1. thus deſcribes their names from *Elias Levita*, that the name of the one was *Jacob* the Son of *Naphtali*, the name of the other *Aaron* the Son of *Aſher*. Who pleaſe may find a large diſcourſe

of

of them in *Buxtorf Fol. de punct. Antiq. Part.* 1. *cap.* 15. It may be enough for my purpose to note, that these two Rabbins are said to have been the Heads of the two Famous Schools of the *Masorites*, the one in *Palestine*, and the other in *Babylon*, and to have spent their whole time in the exact consideration of every Letter, Point and Accent of the Bible; nor is it denied, but that they found out some varieties. The Occidental Jews in *Palestina* and *Europe* following Rabbi *Aaron, Ben-Asher*, the Oriental, or *Babylonian* Jews, following Rabbi *Jacob, Ben-Naphtali*. I find indeed debates among the Learned, concerning the time when those Rabbi's flourished, *Buxtorf de punct. Antiq. Part.* 1. *cap.* 2. from some Jewish Authors affirms them to have lived in the eleventh Century, and thereupon accuses *Genebrard* of a great Errour in *Chronology*, for saying they flourished in the fifth Century; yet *Calvius de Lingua Originali, veteris Testamenti Sect.* 56. contends earnestly, that they lived before the time of *Post-Talmudique Masorites*, by whom this Pamphleter fancies the Bible to have been corrupted. This I must say, if *Ben-Asher* and *Ben-Naphtali* lived so timely as *Genebrard* and *Calovius* affirm, and if they found the Bible corrupted to their hands, it will be an hard task for Romanists to clear how their Vulgar Version escaped the Contagion. But the truth is, whatever were the time wherein those *Rabbins* lived, it is a manifest falshood which this Pamphleter says, *that they did put in Vowels into the Text, which made most different readings*: For, as is observed not only by *Buxtorf Antierit. Part.* 2. *cap.* 5. but also acknowledged by *Capell, Crit. Sac. lib* 3. *cap.* 8. *Sect.* 4. (who yet has screued the various Lections of the Bible to as great an height as any.) These differences of *Ben-Asher*, and *Ben-Naphtali*, are of no moment, being all about Accents and Points, whereby *significatio vocis ne vel hilum mutatur*, the signification of the word is no whit altered: And the same Author, *cap.* 17. *Sect.* 18. after he had given a large account of the different readings betwixt the Oriental and Occidental Jews, concludes thus, *Ex quibus videre est quam nullius momenti sit omnis illa varietas, perinde enim omnino est utram libet sequaris Lectionem.* Yea *Buxtorf loc. cit.* from those differences draws, as he phrases it, *Argumentum fortissimum*, an invincible Argument for the purity of the Hebrew Text. For by the Collection of those various readings of *Ben-Asher*, and *Ben-Naphtali*, it appears how studious, religious, yea and superstitious, the Jewish Doctors were in observing the least varieties which did steal into the Copies of the Holy Bible: if therefore there had been

been any material differences, they had undoubtedly been Recorded by them, consequently those of *Ben-Asher*, and *Ben-Naphtali*, being rather scrupulosities about Orthography than Orthodoxy, it appears evident they found the Scriptures entire and incorrupt, as to the matter. Thus the Pamphleters Objection has furnished us with an Argument against himself.

It's fifthly alledged by the Pamphleter, *that the Hebrew Vowels were added to the Text* 500 *years after Christ, by his professed Enemies the Jews. Answer.* This story, of the late invention of the Hebrew Vowels, is not so certain and uncontroverted, that we must believe it upon this Pamphleters naked Assertion. It is too daring boldness in Jesuits to push at the Authority of the holy Scriptures upon meer conjectures, It's true, *Elias Levita*, a Jewish Rabbin, and skilled Grammarian, who lived in *Germany* about the time of the Reformation, affirmed, that the Hebrew Vowels were invented by some Rabbins at *Tiberias*, after the perfecting of the *Talmud*, some 500 years after Christ. Hereupon *Morinus*, *Gordon* of *Huntly*, and other Jesuits, whom this Pamphleter implicitly follows, took occasion to bark against the holy Scriptures, as being corrupted by that Novel Punctation, though in this they go contrary to *Elias*, who affirms, that the *Masorites* at *Tiberias* in adding the Vowels, adhered faithfully to the true reading of the Scriptures, as they were first given out by *Moses*, and the Prophets. But this whole story of *Elias Levita* is contradicted by the generality of the Jews, who maintain, that if the Hebrew Vowels were not given by the Lord to *Moses* on Mount *Sinai*, with the Letters, yet at least they were added by *Ezra*, and the men of the great Synagogue, who were infallibly guided by the Spirit of God. The Learned *Buxtorf* the Father, in his *Tiberias*, and the Son *de antiq. punct.* have brought many Arguments to confute that Report of *Elias Levita*. It hath also been opposed by *Marcus Marinus*, a Romanist, to whom *Pridiaux Lect. de punct. Orig.* adds *Hierom ab Oleastro*, and *Joannes Picus Mirandula*. D. *Lightfoot*, an Author well versed in Rabbinical Learning, looks upon this story of *Elias Levita* as so incredible, that he spares not to say (as he is cited by D. *Owen*) *Si punctata fuisse Biblia in istiusmodi Schola potes credere, crede & omnia Talmudica*; he that can believe that Fiction, may believe all the Fables of the *Talmud*; nay, the very story, in the judgment of Learned men, convicts it self of falshood: For great Authors, as the two *Buxtorfs*, *Calvinus*, &c. have endeavoured to evict, that the Famous School of Jewish Rabbins at *Tiberias*, was ex-

tinct before the 500 year of Christ; which so far perturbed *Lud. Capellus, de punct. antiquitate cap.* 15. that he leaves his Patron *Elias*, as to this circumstance, to shift for himself, *Falsus fortasse fuerit* (saith *Capell*) *hac in parte* (*hoc est in loci designatione*) *Elias Levita*. Had such a great work been performed by the Doctors of *Tiberias*, it's hardly credible that the world would have taken no notice of it? We have an account by History of the composing of both the *Talmuds*, but no History, Jewish or Christian, for many hundred years after the time assigned by *Elias Levita*, making mention of the punctation of the Hebrew Bible by those *Post Talmudick Masorites* at *Tiberias*. The testimonies alledged by *Elias*, and his Adherents, from *Aben-Ezra*, and some other Rabbins, are learnedly canvased by *Buxtorf. de punct. antiq. Part.* 1. *cap.* 3. And besides the great Patrons of that Novel invention of the Points, *Elias Levita*, *Ludovicus Capellus*, and *Morinus*, are divided among themselves, as to the time when it was done? Had those Enemies of Christ added the Vowels to corrupt the Text, would they not have darkened those Scriptures, *Isa.* 53. *Dan.* 9. which speak so luculently of him, and of his sufferings? Many instances are brought by *Buxtorf de punct. antiq. Part.* 1. *cap.* 11. from *Hierom*, of Hebrew words wherein the Consonants would admit of various readings and significations, yet *Jerom* prefers the reading which is according to the present punctation, and that upon this reason, *Quia sic habetur in Hebræo*, that is, because that reading only is agreeable to the Hebrew Text; which that Learned Author conceives to be a strong presumption, that *Hierom* had seen the Bible in his time pointed with Vowels. Who would see Arguments for the Ancient Punctation of the Hebrew Text, from the *Masorak*, the *Talmud*, the Anti-*Talmudick* Rabbins from Grammar and Divinity, I remit them to those Learned Tractates of the *Buxtorfs*, *Calovius de linguâ orig. veteris testamenti*, from *Sect.* 56. and D. *Owens* forecited Tractate, *cap.* 4, 5. But I am not to concern my self in that Debate, and therefore must mind this Pamphleter, that there be Learned men, both Papists and Protestants, who will not yield that the Hebrew Text is corrupted, though it were granted that the Vowels were a late invention. Hence *Sixtus Senensis in Bib. lib.* 8. *hæres.* 2. *Neque vocalium punctorum additio facta à Judæis quicquam derogat perpetuæ divinorum voluminum sinceritati*. Learned *Capellus*, who hath pleaded more for the Novel Invention of the Points than any, yet in his Tractate *de arcano punctationis revelato*, set forth by *Thomas Erpenius*,

nius, *cap.* 27. maintains, *Haberi posse certo verum & Germanum Textus Hebraici sensum sine punctorum subsidio*; and *Genebrard*, otherwise a most spleenish Writer, yet in his *Isagoge ad legenda scripta Rabbinica* (as cited by *Rivet* in *Isagog. ad sac. script. cap.* 8. *Sect.* 15.) peremptorily denies *lectionem sine punctis esse arbitrariam maneam aut imminutam*; and lately D. *Meric Casaubon* has given some pretty touches to this purpose in his Tractate of Credulity and Incredulity, from *pag.* 92. to 104. where to shew how facile it is to read, and to attain to the distinct meaning of the Hebrew without Vowels, he observes, that the Jews who are well educated in the knowledge of the Hebrew, do not use Vowels in their ordinary Missives, yea nor in their Contracts, which all know have need to be clear; and among other reasons, gives this with *Capell*, that in the Hebrew, there is no word nor syllable without a Consonant; it is not so either in the Greek, Latin, or English, as may appear by these words, *aw*, *to*, *I*, *y u*, *eye*, &c. If then Scriptures may be perfectly read and understood without Points, it doth not follow, that the late invention of points would destroy the integrity of the Scriptures. To shut up this discourse about the Hebrew Points, I ask how the Vulgar Latin Version can be pure, if the Originals be corrupted by addition of the Points. The Pamphleter answers in the words of his Master, *Gordon* of *Huntly*, *That their Vulgar Translation was made before the Original was corrupted.* Whereupon I argue, either the Translator made use of a Bible with Points, or without them, if with Points, then the punctation of the Bible is Anteriour to their Translation; and if the Copy from which their Translation was taken was sincere, the punctation does not corrupt the Text: if without Points, then the Translator, though pretending to no infallible assistance of the Spirit, could attain to the certain meaning of the Text without Points, and consequently, as long as the Hebrew Letters do remain, we are in no worse case than *Jerom*, and the Ancient Church, before the pretended depravation of the Original Text.

It's fifthly alledged by him, *that* Irenæus, Tertull. Origen, *did remark, as says* Eusb. *that the Greek Text of the New Testament was corrupted by Arrians, Macedonians, Nestorians, &c. Hereticks.* Who would not blush at the shameful ignorance which here is bewrayed; it being evident, that none of those Hereticks had arisen in the days of *Irenæus*, *Tertullian* or *Origen*, yea, nor some of them in the days of *Eusebius* himself? Upon the noising abroad of this absurd Er-

rour, I hear Jeſuit *Con*, with the reſt of our Miſſionaries, has been deviſing a Parentheſis to palliate their ſhameful ignorance: But Learned men, no wiſe concerned in this Debate, upon a narrow inſpection of the place, have obſerved, that the words will not admit ſuch a Parentheſis without maniſeſt non-ſenſe: Yet leaſt I ſhould ſeem to injure him, I here exhibit the *formalia verba* of the Pamphleter, *pag.* 55. *Proteſtants* (ſaith he) *take in alſo with thoſe, the corruptions of the Greek Text, remarked in part by S.* Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, *and others*, *ſays* Euſebius, *when the Ancient Hereticks, the Arrians, Macedonians, Neſtorians, &c. had corrupted and adulterated the Word of God to ſupport their Errours.* Let the ingenuous Reader judge, if I have not exhibited the genuine ſenſe of thoſe words; I know not whether to aſcribe it to his ignorance or diſingenuity, *that he charges Proteſtants as taking in, or owning the Arrian, Macedonian, and Neſtorian corruptions of the Bible*: A Calumny ſo far from truth, that to mention it is enough to refute it, it may ſuffice to diſcover the occaſion of ſo groſs a miſtake. The Pamphleter ſteals this Objection, in a Plagiary way, from Jeſuit *Gordon* of *Huntly*, *controv. de verb. Dei cap.* 12. but had no wit to do it handſomely: What Jeſuit *Gordon* had branched forth in divers Arguments againſt the purity of the Greek Text of the New Teſtament, this Pamphleter confuſes together. Jeſuit *Gordon* in his firſt Argument ſaid, that *Irenæus*, *Tertull. Origen*, and others, in *Euſebius*, did complain that Hereticks did corrupt the Scriptures; and in another argument affirms, that *Arrians*, *Macedonians*, *Neſtorians*, did pervert Scriptures. Now the Pamphleter ſeems to have taken thoſe Hereticks, laſt named, to be them of whom *Irenæus*, *Tertull.* and *Origen* did complain, not conſidering that the Ages in which thoſe Fathers wrote, and wherein thoſe Hereticks did ariſe, would diſcover his Errour. But againſt Jeſuit *Gordon*, and him, I argue thus; if the Scriptures were corrupted by Hereticks in the days of thoſe Fathers, then continued they not pure unto *Hieroms* time, as *Gordon* the Jeſuit alledges, and conſequently their own Vulgar Latin muſt be corrupted alſo, as taken from a corrupted Original. But becauſe it's not enough to retort an Argument, let them take an abſolute Anſwer from *Bell. lib.* 2. *de verb. Dei cap.* 7. *Et ſi multa* (ſaith he) *depravare conati ſunt Hæretici, tamen nunquam defuerunt Catholici qui eorum corruptelas detexerunt, & non permiſerunt libros Sacros corrumpi*: That Hereticks attempted the depravation of the Scripture is granted, but that either the Providence of God, or vigilancy of the Catholick Church, ſuffered them univerſally to cor-

rupt

rupt the Scriptures, ſo that the Text of Scripture is not fit *ad gignendam fidem*, as *Gordon* the Jeſuit blaſphemouſly writes, is ſimply denied: That *Ireneus*, *Tertull.* *Origen*, and other Fathers diſcovered the practiſes of Hereticks againſt the Scriptures, is a ſufficient Evidence that thoſe Hereticks were not able to accompliſh their deſigns

His ſixth allegation is, *that Proteſtants nevtr ſaw the Original Scriptures penned by Prophets, Apoſtles, and Copies are ſubject to faults.* Did never this Scribler reflect that it would be retorted upon him, that they can no more produce the Tranſlators Autograph of the Vulgar Latin; than we of the Originals: Neither have they the Autographs of the old Decretals, or of the Ancient Councils, and the Copies of theſe Books are doubtleſs ſubject alſo to faults? I confeſs we pretend not to have the Autographs, nor judge we it neceſſary, yea, it was naturally impoſſible, that Paper or Parchment could have continued ſo long without corruption. What *Baronius* relates of *Marks* Autographs at *Venice*, may have place among their other Legends, yet *Cornel. à Lapide*, who ſays it is in Greek, confeſſes, that through Antiquity it is become illegible, and conſequently uſeleſs: But does it follow, that becauſe we have not the Autographs, therefore our Originals are corrupt? if it be ſaid that Tranſcribers are fallible, are not the Tranſcribers of the Canons of the Council of *Trent* fallible alſo? if notwithſtanding they bear Faith, ſhall not the Copy of Original Scriptures much more make Faith? Cannot the Providence of God preſerve the Original Scriptures? Will not the fear of God make men more tender and circumſpect in tranſcribing the holy Scriptures, than in tranſcribing other Books? Is not the Catholick Church engaged to be watchful, leſt the Scriptures of God ſhould be corrupted? If Univerſal Tradition make Faith in any matter, doth it not concerning the *depoſitum* of the Scriptures?

His ſeventh and laſt allegation is, *of the various Lections of the New Teſtament, atteſted by the Prefacer to the* Biblia Polyglotta. Should he not firſt have remembred how many various Lections are in the Vulgar Latin, let him compare the Bibles of *Sixtus Quintus*, and *Clement* the 8. and read D. *James Bellum Papale*, and then tell if there be not both various Lections and contradictions betwixt them? The different readings betwixt the *Clementine* Bible, and *Hentenius* Edition of the Vulgar Latin, which the Divines of *Lovain* ſo highly eſteemed, would fill a Volum alone. Secondly, therefore it's abſolutely anſwered, that many things are reckoned up as

various

various Lections in the Originals, which are but *Errata ſcribæ aut Typographi*, *i. e.* eſcapes of the Preſs; and all I believe are ſenſible, that it is morally impoſſible that there ſhould be various Editions of any Book, without various readings of that nature, yet may not Judicious perſons, comparing thoſe Copies together, diſcern their *Errata's?* Are there not ſpecial helps, in theſe caſes, for finding out the true reading in the New Teſtament, ſuch as the conſideration of the Context, the Analogy of Faith, the more ancient and approved Copies, Citations, and Expoſitions of Fathers, ancient Tranſlations, particularly the *Syriack*: Neither do Proteſtants deny but uſe may be made of Latin Verſions, eſpecially of more ancient Editions, as was done by *Eraſmus* in his Annotations, yet not as a Rule, but as a mean to be made uſe of in conjunction with the reſt. Who would be more fully ſatisfied, as to theſe various Lections in the New Teſtament, I remit them to *Calvinus de puritate ſinceræ in Novo Teſtamento, Sect.* 134. *&c.* and to D *Owens* Tractate of the integrity and purity of the Hebrew and Greek Text of the Scripture, with his conſiderations on the *Appendix* and *Prolegomena* to the *Biblia Polyglotta*. Now only I add a luculent teſtimony from *Sixtus Senenſis*, *lib.* 7. *Bib. S. hæreſ.* 1. where pondering the like Objection from the various Lections of the New Teſtament, he poſitively aſſerts *Græcum codicem qui nunc in Eccleſia legitur, eundem illum eſſe quo Eccleſia Græca temporibus* Hieronomi, *& longe antea uſque ad tempora Apoſtolorum uſa eſt, verum, ſi verum, fidelem, & nullo falſitatis vitio contaminatum, ſicut continuata omnium Græcorum Patrum lectio lucidiſſime oſtendit, uno ſemper atque eodem Scripturæ textu legentibus* Dionyſio, Juſtino, Irenæo, Melitone, Origene, Africano, Apollinario, Athanaſio, Euſebio, Baſilio, Chryſoſtomo, Theophilacto, *atque aliis ante & poſt tempora* Hieronimi *Patribus*; *i. e.* that the New Teſtament, which to day is read in the Church, is the ſame which the Greek Church read before and after *Hieroms* days, from the time of the Apoſtles, pure and without corruption.

Having diſcuſſed all thoſe things which he brought to confirm his ſecond Objection, I now only take notice of his ludibrious Concluſion, *that ſeeing the Scriptures*, as he falſly alledges, *are corrupt, therefore we have a neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge.* A goodly inference? Is there no way to ſhoulder up a Pope, but by treading down the Scriptures? But ſuppoſing the Scriptures to be corrupted, what benefit, as to this, can we reap by their infallible viſible Judge? Can he dictate to us new pure Original Scriptures? When he could

not

not preſerve them in their Purity, how ſhall he reſtore them to it? If he declare which is pure Scriptures, will he do it by a Prophetical Revelation? Then he would look that his Enthuſiaſms be inſtructed by better Credentials than the Quakers, or if he do it by other ſolid and convincing Evidences, then it's not the infallibility of the Judge, but the evidence of his grounds that will warrant his definitions, conſequently his pretended Infallibility, as to this thing, is wholly inſignificant.

Objection 5. *Pag.* 57. *The Pamphleter enquires what infallible motive can prudently perſwade Proteſtants, that the Word of God they relye on was ever ſet down in writing, or is extant at this day? Is it the teſtimony of the Scripture, calling it ſelf Gods Word, or the innate light of the ſame Scripture ſhewing it ſelf to be ſuch to a well diſpoſed mind? If the firſt, do not* Nicodemus *and* Thomas *Goſpels carry the ſame Titles of* Matthew *and* Mark? *If the ſecond, then the Fathers of the firſt three Ages were not well diſpoſed perſons, who did not acknowledge ſome Books of Scripture till the Authority of a Council of* Carthage *had declared them Canonical, and much leſs* Luther *who rejects* James *Epiſtle, with ſome others.*

Anſwer 1. Doth not this Atheiſtical Cavil of Jeſuits, which hath often been confuted by Proteſtants, fall as heavily upon themſelves, as upon us? May not this ſame Query be made concerning the infallible motive, which can prudently perſwade Romaniſts to believe the infallibility of their viſible Judge? Is it his own teſtimony, calling himſelf infallible, or the innate light of his definitions ſhewing themſelves to be divine? If the firſt, do not Quakers aſſert their own infallibility as well as he? Doth not the *Turks Alcoran* affirm, that it is of Divine Original, as well as Popes aſcribe their definitions to the Holy Ghoſt? If the ſecond, how ſhall an innate light be granted to the definitions of their infallible Judge, ſeeing it's denied to the holy Scriptures of God? It might be ſufficient here to leave him only to grapple with his own Cavil.

But I ſecondly anſwer, that a well diſpoſed mind may be convinced of the Divine Original of the holy Scriptures, both by extrinſick motives of Credibility, and by the *Intrinſeca Criteria*, or the innate light of the holy Scriptures? I ſay, firſt by extrinſick motives, ſuch as the ſtupendious Miracles whereby it was confirmed, (which this calumniating Pamphleter would inſinuate, *pag.* 59. but with Jeſuitical ingenuity) that I did undervalue the Univerſal Tradition of the Catholick Church, the ſignal Judgments of God upon Enemies,

Enemies, the invincible conſtancy of Martyrs, &c. Doth not *Bell. lib. 1. de verb. Dei cap. 2.* by theſe, and ſuch arguments, prove the Scriptures *certiſſimas eſſe & veriſſimas, nec humana inventa, ſed oracula divina continere.* But beſides theſe extrinſick motives of Credibility, the holy Scriptures of God have intrinſick evidences of their Divine Originals, as from the ſublimity of the Myſteries which yet are wonderfully ſuited for bringing about the Salvation of Souls, the untainted and unparallelled Sanctity of the Doctrine, the plenitude of the Scriptures for inſtruction of the Judgment, Reformation of the Life, Conſolation of the heart in all caſes, the admirable temperature of Simplicity and Majeſty in the ſtile of holy Scriptures, the great variety of Scripture purpoſes, and the wonderful harmony thereof, though Scriptures were written in different Ages, Places, and Tongues: So that *Bell.* ſays of the Pen men of Scripture, they would appear *non tam diverſi Scriptores, quam unius Scriptoris diverſi calami.* This ſelf-evidencing light of the Scriptures Jeſuits themſelves are conſtrained to acknowledge in their lucid intervals. Hence *Greg. de Valentia lib. 1. de Analyſ. fidei cap. 1. Deus ipſe* (ſaith he) *imprimis eſt, qui Chriſtianam Doctrinam, atque à Deo Scripturam ſacram veram eſſe, voce Revelationis ſuæ, & interno quodam inſtructu, atq; impulſu humanis mentibus conteſtatur, atq; perſuadet:* And *cap. 15. Cum multa ſint in ipſa Doctrina Chriſtiana, quæ ipſa per ſe illi fidem atque authoritatem conciliare poſſunt, tamen mihi maximum illud eſſe videtur, ut eſt à* Clemente Alexandrino *obſervatum, quod ſua neſcio qua admirabili vi divinè prorſus hominum animos afficit, atque ad virtutem impellit.* It's not ſimply, becauſe the Goſpels of *Matthew* and *Mark* carry their names prefixed, that we believe them to be of a Divine Original, but as we are ſtrongly induced thereto by the extrinſick motives of Credibility, ſo our Faith is ultimately reſolved on the Authority of God, ſpeaking in the Scriptures with an admirable Soul convincing evidence. The Pſeudevangels of *Thomas* and *Nicodemus*, and all Books, without the Canon of holy Scripture, are deſtitute both of theſe motives of Credibility, and of that ſelf evidencing light of their Divine Original. Nor ſhould it ſeem ſtrange to any, that I ſay Faith is ultimately reſolved on the Authority of God ſpeaking in the Scriptures: For all Faculties and Sciences muſt have firſt principles into which our aſſent muſt be terminated, elſe we ſhould run in *infinitum.* I appeal to any that is not willing to be deceived, whether it be not more congruou, that Faith be reſolved into that writing which God himſelf immediately did dictate, by the acknowledgment

ment of the Catholick Church, then either into a Papal, or into a Quaker Enthusiasm, that have no other Credentials, but because they say they are infallibly moved by the Spirit of God..

As for the Pamphleters allegtioan, *that the Fathers of the first Centuries did not acknowledge some Books of Scripture until the Council of Carthage*, it is manifest untruth: Look to *Melito*, his Catalogue of the Books of holy Scripture, recorded by *Eusebius lib.* 4. *Hist. Eccles. cap.* 25. and *Origen*'s recorded by the same *Eusebius*, *lib.* 6. *cap.* 24. or of the Author of the Book *de Eccles. Hierarch. cap.* 3. whom Papists hold for *Denis* the *Areopagite*, or of *Athanasius* in *Synopsi S. Script.* or of the Council of *Laodicea*, *Can.* 59. if they were not conform to the Canon of Scripture received by the Protestant Churches. Any little seeming differences in the way of their and our Enumeration, ye may find cleared by D. *Cosin* in his Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture, *cap.* 4, 5, 6. Is not *Jerom* so explicite for us in this matter in *Prol. Galeat. ad lib. Regum in Prol. ad lib. Solom. in Præfat. ad Danielem & in Epist. ad Paulinum*, that *Bell. lib.* 1. *de verb. Dei cap.* 10. is constrained to grant him to us. It's true indeed, the *Apocrypha* Books which the Council of *Trent* has Canonized, were not acknowledged by the Church in those times as Canonical: And this was one of the seven instances of the contradiction betwixt the present Romish Church, and the Ancient Christian, yea the Ancient Romish Church, in my Answer to M. *Dempsters* eighth Paper, *pag.* 171. which this Pamphleter has not adventured to examine. One thing I must confess, that the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, which both Papists and Protestants acknowledge to be truly Canonical, was not received as such for a long time by the Church of *Rome*, if we may believe *Eusebius lib.* 3. *Hist. Eccles. cap.* 3. or *Jerom Epist.* 129. *ad Dardanum*, who expressly says, that *Latinorum consuetudo Epistolam ad Hebræos non recipit inter Canonicas Scripturas.* Yet notwithstanding this failure of the Roman Church, *Athanasius*, *Nazianzen*, *Hierom*, &c. held it for Canonical, which is a pregnant Evidence, that the Authority of the Books of Scripture, in those days, depended not on the testimony of the Church of *Rome*.

But here the Pamphleter *seems to hint at the Council of* Carthage, *as holding the Apocryphal Books as Canonical*: I suppose he means *Concil. Carthag.* 3. *Can.* 47. but this Council is below Primitive Antiquity, being celebrated either in the close of the fourth, or beginning of the fifth Century: And if Romanists stand to the Canons of that Council, the Supremacy of the Pope is gone. For *Can.* 26. it's

expreſly prohibited, that the Biſhop of *Rome* be called *Summus Sacerdos, princeps Sacerdotum aut aliquid ejuſmodi.* Neither are all the *Apocryphal* Books included in that 47 *Can.* for neither in the Greek Code, nor in the Collection of Canons made by *Creſconius*, is there mention of the Books of *Maccabees*, neither are the reſt of the *Apocryphal* Books, which are there mentioned, ſpoken of as ſtrictly Canonical for proving Articles of Faith. Is it probable that the Fathers in that Council would contradict the Council of *Laodicea*, and *Jerom*, who expreſly denied thoſe Books to be Canonical? Yea, did not *Greg.* after this Council of *Carthage lib.* 9. in *Job cap.* 13. exclude the Books of *Maccabees* from the Canon of Scripture; therefore theſe Books are only termed Canonical, as Books which may be read in the Church: For in no other ſenſe did the Council of *Carthage* own them, as is inſinuated in the cloſe of that ſame Canon 47. where alſo it's added, that the paſſions of the Martyrs may be read in the Churches with theſe Books: But ſure it is the paſſions of the Martyrs are no Canonical Scripture. The Council of *Conſtantinople* in *Trullo Can.* 2. approves both the Synod of *Laodicea*, which excludes the *Apocryphal* Books from the Canon, and that of *Carthage* which reckons them among the Canonical; therefore ſurely this of *Carthage* took the word Canonical in a larger ſenſe than that of *Laodicea*, elſe the Council of *Conſtantinople* had approved contradictory Canons. This ſame alſo may be confirmed from *Auſtin*, who was a prime Member of that Council, for *lib.* 2. *de doct. Chriſti cap.* 8. where he had reckoned out all theſe Books, he ſays they were not all of equal Authority, but all Books of Scripture are of equal Authority. What need I more? Hear their own Cardinal *Cajetan* as to this thing, *in fin. Comment. ad Hiſt. lib.* v. *T. Ne turberis novitie, ſi alicubi reperieris libros iſtos inter Canonicos ſupputatos, vel in ſacris Concilii, vel in ſacris doctoribus —— libri iſti non ſunt Canonici ad confirmanda ea quæ ſunt fidei. Poſſunt tamen dici Canonici ad ædificationem fidelium, utpote in Canone Bibliæ ad hoc recepti & autoriſati. Cum hac diſtinctione diſcernere poteris ſcripta* Auguſtini, *& ſcripta in Provincialibus Conciliis Carthaginenſi & Laodiceno*; and this diſtinction *Cajetan* took from *Hierom*, *Præfat. in Proverb.* and *Ruffin in exp. ſ. Symb.*

What he adds concerning *Luther*, does not concern the Cauſe: Were it true that *Luther* doubted of the Authority of the Epiſtle of *James*, it would only conclude, that he knew but in part; and what then? *Non omnia vidit Bernardus.* Though the Scriptures be a Principle in Divinity, yet ſome holy men may queſtion the Divine Original

ginal of ſome Books of holy Scripture: For there is need of ſpiritual illumination to diſcern the Scriptures of God; and as the Spirit breaths where he liſts, ſo alſo in a more eminent meaſure upon one than another? Do not Romaniſts hold Cardinal *Cajetan* for a Catholick? who yet really did queſtion both the Authority of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and of *James*. Yea, have not ſome principles of Reaſon been queſtioned by learned Philoſophers, which are admitted by others? Is it not a principle of Mathematicks, that *a quovis puncto ad quodvis punctum licet ducere rectam lineam*? Yet is it not queſtioned by Learned *Baſſo*, if there be a right line in the world? But concerning *Luther*, in this matter, I remit the Reader to *Gerard* the Lutheran in *uberiori exigeſ. loc. de ſcript. cap.* 10. *Sect.* 279, 280. where *Gerard* Apologizes for *Luther*, and evicts, that *Luther* did not perſevere in that miſtake; and withal acknowledges and proves the Divine Authority of that Epiſtle.

The Pamphleter in his fourth Objection *pag.*68. affirms, *that this is common to Proteſtants, with all Hereticks, to laycleim to Scriptures.* To this common Cavil of Romaniſts, as may be ſeen in *Greg. de Val. lib.* 6. *de Analyſ. fidei cap.* 8. and *Breerly Apol. tract* 1. *Sect.* 10 *ſubd.*2. and *tract.* 2. *cap.* 1. *Sect.* 1. I anſwer 1. That it is a maniteſt falſehood, that all Hereticks do appeal to the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, as the adequate Rule of Faith, as do the Proteſtant Churches. What meant *Tertull. lib. de Reſurrectione carnis*, when he termed Hereticks *Luciſugas Scripturarum*? what meant that of *Irenæus lib.* 3. *cap.* 2. *cum ex Scripturis arguuntur in accuſationem convertuntur Scripturarum*? Doth not *Euſeb. lib.* 5. *Hiſt. cap. ult.* teſtifie, that *Artemon* the Heretick did appeal to Tradition, pretending that his Hereſie, *viz.* that Chriſt was ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον a meer man, had a Traditive conveyance from the Apoſtles, and that in the Church of *Rome* alſo, until Pope *Victors* time, *incluſivè*? Doth not Learned D *Morton* in his Appeal againſt *Breerly lib.* 2. *cap.* 25. *Sect.* 12. *Sect.* 39. ſhew, that Learned Romaniſts, *Aquinas*, *Bell. Sixtus Senenſis*, *Juſtus*, *Barronius*, *Delrio*, *Rhenanus*, and M. *Weſton* do confeſs, that the moſt notorious and peſtilent Hereticks, ſuch as the *Valentinians*, *Gnoſticks*, *Marcionites*, *Baſilidians*, *Encratits*, *Severians*, *Manichees*, *Arrians*, *Carpocratians*, *Montaniſts*, *Donatiſts*, *Anabaptiſts*, &c. refuſed to be tryed only by Canonical Scripture, and did ſhelter themſelves under the pretext either of Philoſophical principles, or feigned Goſpels, Traditions, or fancied Revelations. The teſtimonies of Authors for proving this, I remit to be gathered from D. *Mor-*

ton. Have not ſome Hereticks denied many of the Books of the holy Scripture, whereof a large Catalogue may be had from *Bell. lib.* 1. *de verb. Dei cap.* 5. & 6. yea doth not *Bell. loc. cit.* charge the *Manichees* as denying the whole Scriptures both of Old and New Teſtament; did ever Proteſtant Churches ſo? Doth not the ſame *Bell. lib.* 1. *cap.* 1. charge *Gaſpar Swenkfeldius*, and the Libertines, as declining the Scriptures, and only flying to the inward dictates of the Spirit? Were there ingenuity among Romaniſts, would they be ſo impudent in their accuſations of Proteſtants? In appealing to Scripture, we imitate the ancient Fathers. Hence *Auſtin de Gra. & lib. arb. cap.* 18. *Sedeat inter nos judex, Apoſtolus Joannes lib.* 2. *de nupt. & concupiſc. cap* 33. *iſta controverſia judicem requirit, judicet ergo Chriſtus judicet & cum illo Apoſtolus, quia in Apoſtolo ipſe loquitur Chriſtus.* And to the like purpoſe *Optatus lib.* 5. *cont. Parmen. de cælo quærendus eſt judex, ſed quid ſpulſamus cælum quum habemus in Evangelio teſtamentum.* I deny not but Hereticks have perverted Scriptures for the Patrociny of their errours: But excellently did one deſcribe the nature of Hereticks in this, *Si videant petitis è Scriptura demonſtrationibus ſtultitiam ſuam conſtringi, tum Scripturæ recuſant ſcopum & uſum, ſiquando vero putant ſibi favere nudum aliquid effatum à genuina receſum orationis ſerie, ad ſuum propoſitum accommodant ſuis confirmandis.* And this is all which *Vincentius*, *Gennadius*, and *Auſtin*, in the places cited by the Pamphleter, and other Romaniſts, do inſinuate. Excellently ſaid the old Jewiſh Rabbins, *In quocunque Scripturæ loco invenis objectionem pro Hereticis, invenis quoque medicamentum in latere ejus.*

2. Therefore I deny the ſequel: Though Hereticks do appeal to Scripture, yet it doth not follow, that the Scriptures are not the Rule of Faith, and Ground of the Religion of Proteſtants. Do not the moſt Paradoxal Philoſophers appeal to the Principles of Reaſon in confirmation of their abſurd Theorems? Shall therefore Principles of Reaſon not be the Rule by which to diſcern betwixt true and falſe Concluſions in Philoſophy? Will not a Litigious Caviller appeal to the Law for juſtifying his moſt injurious actions? ſhall therefore the Law ceaſe to be the Rule to diſtinguiſh betwixt juſt and unjuſt? This Pamphleter argues againſt us, as if I ſhould argue thus againſt him, Juntaniſts, whom he holds for Hereticks, appeal to the ſentence of an infallible viſible Judge, as well as Jeſuits; therefore the ſentence of the infallible viſible Judge cannot be the Rule of Faith: Or thus, Quakers pretend to an infallible direction of the Spirit,

Spirit, as well as the Pope or General Council; therefore they are deceivers, as well as thoſe. To ſhut up this Anſwer, it's not the claiming of conformity with Scriptures that proves a true Religion, but the having of it; and in evidence that we do not barely claim it, but have it, we are content to undergo the moſt accurate ſcrutiny. The more Romaniſts have contended with us theſe 150 years, the more the truth of the Proteſtant Religion hath ſhined forth.

SECT. IV.

Some Reflections on the reſt of the Pamphleters Rapſodick Diſcourſe concerning the Rule of Faith.

FRom *Pag.* 61. to the end of his *Sect.* 4. he hath a long Rapſodick and incoherent Diſcourſe, wherein he endeavours to abuſe an unwary Reader by bold Aſſertions, empty Rhetorications, and miſſtating of Queſtions: Were theſe frothy flouriſhes reduced to an accurate way of arguing, they would vaniſh into ſmoak, and nonſence, yet I ſhall touch what may ſeem moſt material therein.

Firſt then he brings me in aſſerting, *that Scriptures are either clear in* terminis, *or are made clear by conferring of places*: But he cites no place where I affirm this, nor I believe will he find ſuch an Aſſertion in ſo many words in all my Papers, againſt M *Demſter*. However, I acknowledge I have ſaid, that Articles of Faith are contained either in *terminis* in Scripture, or elſe that by firm conſequences they may be deduced from that which is there expreſly revealed: Nor do I deny but Proteſtants hold, that conferring of Scripture with Scripture, is an uſeful mean for finding out the true meaning of Scripture. I ſhall therefore examine what this Scribler can bring againſt it.

And firſt he ſays, *Though a place of Scripture be clear in it ſelf, yet when divers Sects take it diverſly, a man may juſtly ſuſpect his own judgment, ſeeing ſo many of a contrary mind.* I know not what can be inferred from this irrational Aſſertion, but either Scepticiſm in Religion, or down-right Atheiſm: For when a Scripture is clear in it ſelf; it carries with it ſufficient evidence, that this is the Mind of God therein. If then, notwithſtanding this clearneſs, one may juſtly ſuſpect that this is not the Mind of God, then he may have juſt ground to queſtion what God ſays when he ſpeaks clearly: And if the ſenſe of clear Scripture may be ſuſpected, may not the ſenſe of

the

the definitions of any visible Judge be questioned much more? I confess the contradictions of rational persons ought to make us seriously consider what Scripture says, but if it speak clearly, no contradiction of Hereticks gives just ground to question the true sense thereof: Did *Athanasius* question the Truth when it was contradicted by a World of Arrians, though Pope *Liberius* also did subscribe the sentence against him? Doth not the Apostle teach, that the Faith of Divine Truths should be so firm that if an Angel would contradict it, we should not believe him, *Gal.* 1.8.

Next he objects, *That Hereticks for their Heresie alledge places of Scripture as would seem clear, as* Marcion *justified his despising* Moses *by these words*, Joh. 10. 8. All that ever came before me are Thieves and Robbers: *The Manichees, they fancy that Christ is the Sun, by that* Joh. 8. 12. I am the Light of the World: *The Waldenses, that the Magistrate ought not to put a Criminal to death, because its said*, Exod. 20. Thou shalt not kill. *Yea*, says he, *the Devil cited clear Scripture against Christ, and the Jews against his Death.* Did ever *Beelzebub* blaspheme more grossly than this Jesuit? if *the Devil cited clear Scripture*, why did not Christ hearken to him? Do not their own Interpreters, *Jansen. in concord. Evang. cap.* 15. *Maldonat*, and *à Lapide* in *Matth.* 4. 6. shew, that the Devil grossly perverted that Scripture? Did not the Devil mutilate the Text which he cited out of *Psal.* 91. 11. leaving out, *In all thy ways*, as is excellently noted by *Bernard Serm.* 14. *in Psalmum qui habitat. Quid mandavit nempe quod in Psalmo sequitur ut custodi aut custodiant te in viis tuis? Nunquid in præcipitiis? Qualis via hæc de pinnaculo Templi mittere te deorsum? Non est via hæc, sed ruina. & si via tua est, non illius.* Did not Christ, by collating the Scripture cited by the Devil, with another, *Deut.* 6. 16. demonstrate, that the Devil did pervert the Scripture, contrary to its sense, and thereby did confirm the truth which the Jesuit here impugnes; *viz.* that collation of Scripture with Scripture, is one solid mean to find out the true sense of Scripture? What though *Hereticks for their Heresies do alledge Scriptures as would seem clear?* Is there not as great odds betwixt a Scripture seemingly clear, and really clear, as betwixt a Jesuits Sophism, and a real demonstration? May not all those perversions of Scripture by *Marcionites, Manichees, &c.* be sufficiently cleared without the sentence of an infallible visible Judge? Is it not apparent, that it was an impious inference from *Joh.* 10. 8. *that* Moses *was a Thief or Robber?* seeing he was faithful in all the House of God, as a servant,

Heb.

Heb. 3. 6. That place *Joh.* 10. 8. pronounces them only Thieves and Robbers, who run without a Miſſion from God, as *Auſtin* expounds *lib.* 16. *contra Fauſtum cap.* 12. or that gave themſelves out for the *Meſſias*, ſuch as *Judas* of *Galilee*, and *Theudas*, *&c.* So *Chryſoſt. Cyril, Theophil. Enthym*, cited by *à Lapide* on the place, none of which did *Moſes*. Is not the fancy of the *Manicheans* from *Joh.* 8. 12. as impious and ludibrious? Is not Chriſt *God over all*, *bleſſed for ever*, *Rom.* 9. 5. therefore as *Auſtin* ſaid excellently, *Tract.* 34. *in Joh. Eſt Lux quæ fecit hanc lucem*, he is not the Sun, but the Light which made the Sun. As for that Tenet he charges upon the *Waldenſes*, they are vindicated from it by Learned *Uſher*, *de Chriſtian. Eccleſ. ſucceſſ. & ſtat. cap.* 6. *Edit.* 2. *pag.* 198. and by *Perrin* Hiſt. of *Walden. lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. Yea, *Alphonſus à Caſtro*, albeit he following the Drove, accuſe them of it, yet confeſſes, that *Æneas Sylvius* in *lib. de orig. Bohemorum cap.* 35. in reckoning out the errours of the *Waldenſes*, charges them with no ſuch thing. However, ſurely that Poſition has no Foundation in that Text *Exod.* 20. 13. For the Magiſtrate, *Rom.* 13. bears not the Sword in vain, and Scripture expreſly injoyns the puniſhing of ſundry Criminals capitally, particularly Murtherers, *Numb.* 35. 31. So that thoſe impious gloſſes which Hereticks have put upon Scripture, may be clearly confuted by Scripture, if it were not ſo, what could the Romiſh infallible Judge do? What ground ſhould he have upon which to pronounce this to be the ſenſe of the place, and not that which Hereticks pretend? if the Popes definition be the only way to vindicate Scriptures from gloſſes of Hereticks, why has he not given us a clear Commentary upon the whole Scripture? As Hereticks wreſt ſentences of Scripture, may they not wreſt ſentences of Popes or Councils? They can bring no Objection againſt us, which recoils not upon their own head.

He clamours, *pag.* 61. *that there may be many ſeeming contradictions in Scripture*: What then? *Ergo*, all things neceſſary to ſalvation are not clearly ſet down in Scripture, or by firm conſequence deducible from it. *Non ſequitur.* There are not only ſeeming, but real contradictions, betwixt the definitions of their Popes, and Canons of their Councils, one Council decreeing that the General Council is above the Pope, another decreeing, that the Pope is above the Council, and both approved by Popes; for as the *Lateran* which did ſubject the Council to the Pope, was approved by *Leo* the 10. ſo alſo was the Council of *Conſtance*, which ſubjected the Pope to the Council,

Council, approved and confirmed by Pope *Martyn* 5. *Sess.* 45. but the holy Scripture is not Yea and Nay.

He objects *ibid. That many things are believed by Protestants which are not in Scripture at all, as Persons in the Trinity, Sacraments in the Church, the Command of keeping the Sunday. Answ.* I would have apprehended the Pamphleter would have heard of *Nazianzen*'s distinction, *Orat.* 37. that *quædam sunt in Scripturis quæ non dicuntur, quædam & sunt & dicuntur*: There are Points of Faith materially contained in Scripture, though the words which the Catholick Church uses to explain these Mysteries be not there found. Thus the Merits and Satisfaction of Christ are found in Scripture, and luculently demonstrated thence against the *Socinian*, though those words be not found in Scripture. Did not the ancient Fathers demonstrate from Scripture the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, although the word ὁμοούσιος was not in Scripture? It's enough that the thing meant by the word Persons, and Sacraments, and a sufficient Warrant to keep the Lords day, be found there: Yea, have we not the word Person, *Heb.* 1. 3. *Who is the expres Image of his Person*, τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. Albeit I be not ignorant of the Logomachies which were among Ancients concerning the words οὐσία and ὑποστάσις. As for the Command concerning the Lords Day, besides other Warrants to observe it from the Scripture, such as the practice of the Apostles, the title of ἡμέρα κυριακὴ, *Revel.* 1. 10. the Apostolick Injunction, 1 *Cor.* 16. 1, 2. Has not Learned M. *Candrey* demonstrated a preceptive Authority for it, from the fourth Command, in his *Sabbatum Redivivum*, *Part.* 2. *cap.* 7. *Part.* 3. *cap.* 3. *Part.* 4. *cap.* 1. As for the Sacraments, I hope the Institution of Baptism, and the Lords Supper, is clear in Scripture; and other Sacraments we know none. As for the *definition of a Sacrament* given by me in my tenth Paper against M. *Demster*, at which here he snarks, when he gets confidence to examine it, he shall find it will abide the Test. In fine, could any Romanist solidly prove that any of the Articles of our Religion are not contained in Scripture, I should ingenuously disown them.

It's further objected, *pag.* 63. *that many places of Scripture are flatly against Protestants, and for Papists*; as Matth. 26. 26. Jam. 2. 24. 2. Thes. 2. 13. yea he is bold to say, *that Protestants can never be able to bring one clear Scripture against any of their Tenets.* These be big words, but splendid untruths. Can we bring no clear Scripture against any Tenet of Popery? Is not that Scripture clear against their

Dry

Dry Communions, *Matth.* 26. 27. *Drink ye all of it?* Is not that Scripture expreſs againſt Purgatory, *Revel.* 14. 13. *Bleſſed are the Dead which die in the Lord; from henceforth, yea ſaith the Spirit, that they may reſt from their labours.* If they reſt from their labours, then they labour not in the flames of Purgatory. Is not that a clear Scripture againſt Image-worſhip, *Exod.* 20. 4, 5. *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven Image, nor the likeneſs of any thing: Thou ſhalt not bow down to them, &c.* I know the Pamphleter ſays, *that this is a corrupt Verſion, and that it ſhould be rendred Idol, not Image, it being* Peſel *in the Hebrew*: But that is a corrupt evaſion, ſay I; doth not the root *Paſal* ſignifie, *dolare, ſculpere*: Hence the *Chaldee* renders it *Tſalma*, an Image. Do not their own *Pagnin* and *Montanus* render it *ſculptile*? But whatever be of that, is it not added in the Hebrew, *Ve col temuna*, or any likeneſs of any thing? Are not here then all Images, in ſo far as they are made objects of Adoration, prohibited? But grant that it ought to be rendred an Idol, yet doth not the Adoration of an Image make it an Idol? Did not Adoration make the Brazen Serpent an Idol, which before was not one? Hence is that of *Tertull. lib. de Idololatria, cap.* 4. *Imaginum conſecratio eſt Idololatria*, and *Iſidore lib.* 8. *Orig. cap.* 11. *Idolum eſt ſimilachrum, quod humana effigie factum & conſecratum eſt*, according to the known Diſtich.

Qui ſacros fingit auro vel marmore vultus,
Non facit ille Deos, qui colit ille facit.

Yea, ſo evident is this, that their great School-man *Vaſq. Tom.* 1. *in* 3. *Part. q.* 25. *diſp.* 104. *cap.* 2. confeſſes, that by this Command all Adoration of Images was prohibited to the Jews: whence I conclude, therefore alſo to Chriſtians, the Moral Law ſtanding ſtill in force. *Rom.* 3. 31. *Do we by Faith make void the Law, nay rather we eſtabliſh it.* I might run through other Points in difference betwixt Romaniſts and us, for I know none of them but may be diſproved by luculent Scriptures.

Whereas he ſays theſe three Scriptures, *Mat.* 26. 26. *Jam.* 2. 24. 2 *Theſ.* 2. 13. *are flatly againſt Proteſtants*, he too flatly diſcovers either his own ignorance, or impudency; the harmony betwixt theſe, and the Doctrine of Proteſtants, hath been abundantly cleared by our Authors, who handle the Controverſies of the Preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, Juſtification and Traditions.

Now ſhortly, I ſay firſt, that theſe words, *This is my Body*, make no more for the Tranſubſtantiation of Bread into the Body of Chriſt

than these, 1 *Cor.* 10. 4. *the Rock was Christ*, for a Transubstantiation of the Rock into Christ: Yet, their Transubstantiating sense cannot be admitted, without falsifying the words of Christ; as I demonstrated against M. *Demster*, and shall shew in its own place, that my Argument stands yet in force, notwithstanding the Pamphleters insignificant attempts to the contrary. In evidence hereof, after Consecration, it's frequently called Bread, 1 *Cor.* 11. 26, 27.

I proceed therefore to the second Scripture, *Jam.* 2. 24. *Ye see that a man is justified by Works, and not by Faith only.* That this place is not so clear for them, may appear by joyning them with some other places from the Apostle *Paul*, *Rom.* 3. 28. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by Faith, without the works of the Law: Rom. 4. 5, 6. *To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, is Faith counted for righteousness, even as* David *described the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works*, Gal. 2. 16. *Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the Law, but by the Faith of Jesus Christ*; ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως, *nisi per fidem*; which *Estbius*, upon the place, acknowledges to be equivalent to, *sed tantum per fidem*, but only by Faith: And he affirms, that the most Learned, both of Greek and Latin Interpreters, do agree in that Exposition. These, and other Texts of the Apostle *Paul*, seem to stand in so full contradiction to the sense which Romanists impose upon the words of *James*, that they have devised many Cob web distinctions to elude those luculent testimonies of the Apostle S. *Paul*: Some affirming, *that he excludes only from Justification the works of the Ceremonial Law*, not remembring that he excludes the works of that Law which is established by the Gospel; as is clear, comparing *Rom.* 3. 28. with verse 31. but that is surely the Moral Law. Others finding that they cannot deny but he excludes the works of the Moral Law, yet say, *that only these works, as done before Conversion and without Grace, are excluded.* Others say, *that the Apostle S.* Paul *speaks only of the first Justification, but not of the second.* But the Apostle S. *Paul*, *Rom.* 4. to confirm his Assertion of Justification by Faith without the works of the Law, brings in the instances of *David* and *Abraham*, long after their Conversion; and therefore he excludes not only works before Conversion, neither speaks he only of that which Romanists call the first Justification. I shall not digress, to examine that distinction of the first and second Justification; but surely, in the Romish sense, it presupposes a Justification by inherent holiness, or by works, and so

ſo is a begging of the queſtion: Only to prevent Logomachies and miſtakes about words, it would be conſidered, that the chief queſtion betwixt Romaniſts and us in this thing is, concerning the meritorious cauſe of Juſtification; what it is that purchaſes to us Remiſſion of ſin, and right to Eternal Life. Now I might appeal to all ſerious and imprejudiced perſons, what elſe can do this, but the obedience of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt? Can our good works, either before or after Converſion, ſatisfie Divine Juſtice, or merit to us remiſſion of ſins, and a right to eternal life? Is there any proportion betwixt our works, and that Eternal, and far more exceeding weight of Glory, or the wrath, to the uttermoſt, due to us for our ſins? Are we not bound, *Luke* 17. 10. *When we have done all that we are commanded, to acknowledge our ſelves unprofitable ſervants*? for we have but done that which was our duty to do. Are not our beſt performances ſtained with gradual defects? *Eccleſ.* 7. 20. *Eſay* 64. 6. *All our righteouſneſſes are as filthy rags.* Is not that ſaying of S. *Greg.* known, *lib.* 9. *Moral. in Job cap.* 11. *Omnis humana juſtitia, injuſtitia eſſe convincitur, ſi diſtrictè judicetur: prece ergo poſt juſtitiam indiget, ut quæ ſuccumbere diſcuſſa poterat, ex ſola judicis pietate convaleſcat.* Does any man love God ſo well as he ought? ſays not S. *Auſtin Epiſt.* 29. *Pleniſſima charitas eſt in nemine. Illud autem quod minus eſt quam eſſe debet, in vitio eſt*? Do we not ſtand in need of mercy to our beſt works? *Neh.* 13. 22. Are they not *made acceptable to God through Jeſus Chriſt*? 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. Can we then be pronounced by God perfectly juſt on the account of theſe? or are we not rather pronounced juſt upon the account of the obedience of Chriſt, for which theſe are accepted, and we our ſelves alſo? *Epheſ.* 1. 6. *He hath made us accepted in the beloved.* Is not that Scripture luculent, *Rom.* 5. 19. *By the obedience of one ſhall many be made righteous*? If any might have placed confidence on their works, to be juſtified thereby, then ſurely the Apoſtle S. *Paul* might have done it, but he durſt not adventure on it: 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. *I know nothing by my ſelf, yet am I not hereby juſtified.*

It remains then to be expounded, in what ſenſe a man is ſaid *Jam.* 2. 24. to be juſtified by works, and not by Faith only. Far be it from us to impoſe, with Romaniſts, a gloſs upon S. *James*; which, upon the matter, would make him contradict S. *Paul.* The word of the Lord is not yea and nay, many have taken excellent pains to clear the harmony of theſe two Apoſtles, and to vindicate this place of S. *James* from the Cavils of Romaniſts. I will not here digreſs, to

examine the new notions of ſome late Learned Writers touching this matter, whoſe way ſhould I imbrace, I might perhaps eaſily expede my ſelf from Romiſh Cavils, and leave alſo ſome conſiderable differences betwixt the Romiſh Party and Proteſtants in this matter: But I confeſs I am afraid of new Methods, eſpecially in a matter of ſo great importance, as the point of Juſtification: And therefore holding to the more received grounds, I ſhall remit the Reader to Reverend Biſhop *Downam*, his learned Treatiſe of Juſtification, *lib.* 7. *cap.* 8. where he both diſcuſſes *Bellarmine's* Quibbles, as alſo illuſtrates that place in S. *James*, by an Elegant Analytick Expoſition, from *ver.* 14. to the end of the Chapter. Let it ſuffice at preſent to advertiſe the Reader, that S. *James* uſes neither the word *Faith*, nor the word *Juſtifie*, in the ſame ſenſe with S. *Paul*, nor does he debate the queſtion which S. *Paul* handled, or which is at this day toſſed betwixt Romaniſts and us. For clearing theſe things, briefly I ſay firſt, when S. *James* ſays, *we are not juſtified by Faith only*, he takes not Faith for a ſaving Grace of the Spirit, receiving whole Chriſt, *John* 1. 12. *purifying the heart*, Act. 15. 9. *and working by love*, *Gal.* 5. 6. which is the only true Faith by which we are juſtified, according to the Doctrine of S. *Paul*, and the Reformed Churches: But S. *James* takes Faith for a dogmatical aſſent to Divine Truths, joyned with an outward profeſſion, but ſuch as may be ſeparated from good works, as is evident from the ſeries of his whole diſcourſe, particularly from *ver.* 14. where the ſtate of the queſtion which S. *James* handles is propounded, *What doth it profit, my Brethren, though a man ſay he hath Faith, and have not works?* μη δυναται η πιστις σωσαι αυτον. Can that Faith ſave him, by which it appears S. *James* whole diſcourſe is, concerning that Faith which a man ſaith he hath, but may be void of good works: Now that is not the Faith, by which we, according to the Apoſtle S. *Paul's* Doctrine, affirm a man to be juſtified without the works of the Law; for true juſtifying Faith, is a living and working Faith. But *Jam.* 2. 17. *Faith, if it have no works, is dead, being alone.* I add ſecondly, that when S. *James* ſays, *that a man is juſtified by works*, he does not ſpeak as S. *Paul*, of the true proper Act of Juſtification, which is a Judicial Act of God, really acquitting the ſinner of guiltineſs, and from the wrath of God, to which he was lyable, but of a declarative Juſtification, or of that which evidences a man to be in a juſtified eſtate, or to be acquitted from guilt and wrath: Nor needs this ſeem ſtrange to any, it being a Rule among Interpreters of

Scripture;

Scripture; *quandoque tunc dicitur aliquid esse, aut fieri, quum esse intelligitur, aut declaratur*: A thing is said to be done, when it becomes manifest that it is done: So *Levit.* 13. 3, 13. The Priest is said to pollute, or cleanse the Leper, because he declared him clean, or unclean: So *Act.* 10. 15. *What God hath cleansed, defile thou not*, σὺ μὴ κοίνου, *declare thou not common, or unclean.* And this word *Justification* is frequently taken in a like sense, as *Luk.* 7. 24. 35. *Rom.* 3. 4. 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. &c. That so it is taken here, Learned Protestants have evicted from the Context: I only desire the Reader to cast his eyes upon verse 18. *A man may say, thou hast Faith, and I have Works, shew me thy Faith without Works, and I will shew thee my Faith by my Works.* Where it's apparent, that the Apostle is enquiring after the Evidences of a Justified Estate, which he concludes to be good works. The chief difficulty which here seems to arise is, that if the Apostle *James* did here speak only of a declarative Justification, then he would have ascribed this Justification only to good works, and not at all to Faith; whereas the Apostle gives good works, and Faith, a conjunct interest in the Justification whereof he treats; *you see then, how by Works a man is justified, and not by Faith. Answ.* This inference would perhaps have some strength, had the Apostle been speaking only of the internal act of Faith; but not at all, when, as hath been shewed, the Faith spoken of, is a professed Faith; for the profession of Faith may concur with good works, to declare and evidence a person to be in a Justified Estate. Thirdly therefore, and lastly, for the full illustration of this whole matter, we would carefully notice the different questions handled by the two Apostles, S. *Paul*, and S. *James*. The Apostle S. *Paul*, in his Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, having to do with persons who Pharisaically boasted of their good works, and presumed, as our Romanists do to this day, to be justified thereby, or at least joyned their good works, with Faith in Christ, as the ground of their Justification before God: Therefore he disputes at length the same question, which now is agitated betwixt Romanists and us, what is the true ground upon which a sinner is accepted of God, and pronounced by him Just, as if he had perfectly kept the whole Law in his own person; and to hammer down these proud Justitiaries, he concludes, that the only ground of this Justification of a sinner before God, is the obedience of Christ laid hold upon by Faith, and totally secludes good works from having any causal influence upon Justification; which he proves, besides many other Arguments, by the most apposite examples of *Abraham*

braham and *David*. For if any could have been justified by works, then surely *Abraham* and *David*, persons of so Eminent Holiness, had been justified thereby, but not they, as he shews, *Rom.* 4. *Ergo*, none at all. But S. *James*, on the other hand, had to do with a kind of Epicures, who abusing S. *Paul*'s Doctrine of Justification by Faith without the works of the Law, maintained there was no necessity of good works, but only to profess Faith in Christ. This is S. *Austin*'s observe, and not mine, in *Psal.* 31. *Jacobus vult corrigere eos qui Paulum male intelligendo, nolebant bene operari, de sola fide præsumentes.* So that the question which S. *James* agitates is, whether there be a necessity of good works; which he resolves affirmatively, and withal attests, that though they be not the causes of our Justification before God, yet they are the inseparable effects of a Justifying Faith, and the Evidences of a Justified Estate. For this end he brings in not only the example of *Abraham*, but also of *Rahab*, who of an Infidel had been proselyted to the Faith, yet she also demonstrated the soundness of her Faith, by her works of mercy to the Servants of God. Thus the harmony of these two Apostles may luculently appear; the Apostle *Paul* shews good works have no causal influence upon Justification; the Apostle *James* teaches, that though they be not the causes, yet they demonstrate the truth of a Justifying Faith: For as S. *Austin* says, *lib. de fide & operibus cap.* 14. good works *sequuntur Justificatum*, *non præcedunt Justificandum* that which follows Justification, can neither causally nor formally justifie, but well may evidence a Justified Estate; and this was all which S. *James* intended. But what need I more, their own *Aquinas* in *cap.* 3. *Epist. ad Galat. Lect.* 4. expressly confesses, *quod bona opera non sunt causa, quod aliquis sit justus apud Deum, sed potius executiones & manifestationes Justitiæ*, that good works are not causes why any is just before God, but the executive demonstrations of righteousness, or of a Justified Estate. I know there be many Cavils raised against this by *Bell.* and other Advocates of the Romish Cause, but they are copiously discussed by our Controversists, and lately *Turretinus exercit. de concord. Pauli & Jacobi in articulo Justificationis.*

Proceed we now to the third and last place, 2 *Thes.* 2. 13. which the Pamphleter supposes *to be clear for their unwritten Traditions*: It's indeed ordinary with Romanists, where ever they find mention of Traditions in Scripture, to draw it to their unwritten Traditions: But this very place discovers their mistake, for the Apostle speaks of Traditions by Epistle, as well as by word; then sure there

are

are written Traditions. I know nothing that here can be objected, but that he mentions Traditions, not only by Epiſtle, but alſo by word: To which I anſwer, from this indeed it follows, that Doctrines of Faith were delivered to the Church of *Theſſalonica*, both by word and writ: It holds out theſe two different ways by which Divine Truths were conveyed to them from the Apoſtles; but it cannot be concluded from this Scripture, that any Articles of Faith were delivered by word to this Church of *Theſſalonica*, which were not contained in the Epiſtles written to them, yet granting, that ſome Articles of Faith had been Orally delivered to them, which were not contained in theſe two Epiſtles to the Church of *Theſſalonica*, yet nothing can be inferred againſt us, except he could prove that theſe Articles were not to be found in any other Scripture. Let this Pamphleter, if he can, give us an account of the Articles of Faith Orally delivered to the *Theſſalonians*, which are not to be found either in theſe Epiſtles, or in any other Scripture; if he cannot, which no Romaniſts as yet have been able to do, let them once learn to acknowledge, that this Scripture makes nothing for them. I muſt remember him that *Bell.* confeſſes, *lib.* 4. *de verb. Dei cap.* 11. *that the Apoſtles committed to writing whatever was neceſſary*; either then it muſt be acknowledged theſe Traditions are not neceſſary, or elſe, according to *Bell.* they muſt be delivered in the written word. Cardinal *Perron*, as I find him cited by M. *Chillingworth*, in his *Proteſtants ſafe way*, *cap.* 3. *Sect.* 46. conjectures, that the Tradition, of which the Apoſtle here ſpeaks, was of the hinderance of the coming of Antichriſt. Grant that the Cardinal hath hit right, yet ſeeing neither he, nor the Romiſh Church, can give an account what that hinderance was which the Apoſtle meant, it ſtill appears, how unſure a Traditive conveyance is, and that the knowledge of that hinderance cannot be neceſſary now, or a point of Faith, ſeeing God hath permitted it to be loſt.

Pag. 63. and 64. the Pamphleter urges, *that Heretieks, ſuch as* Arrians, Eutychians, Manichees, Neſtorians, Valentinians, *and* Apollinariſts, *by collating Scripture with Scripture, did confirm their blaſphemous Hereſies*: But what is that to the purpoſe? Doth it therefore follow, that collating Scripture is not a mean for finding out the true ſenſe of Scripture? Might he not as well argue, that becauſe ſome by eating do poyſon themſelves, therefore eating is not a mean to preſerve the life of man; or becauſe ſome Hereticks have brought the Teſtimonies of Fathers, Councils, yea, and alſo of

Popes

Popes to confirm their Hereſies, therefore none of thoſe do contribute to find out the true ſenſe of Scripture? It is Blaſphemy to ſay, that reading or collating of Scripture, is the proper cauſe of Hereſie. S. *Auſtin* aſſigns far different cauſes, when *lib. de util. cred. cap.* 1. he defines an Heretick to be one, *qui alicujus temporalis commodi & maxime gloriæ principatuſque ſui gratiâ, falſas ac novas opiniones vel gignit vel ſequitur*: Where he holds out, that it's from Pride, Avarice, or ſome ſuch vicious Principle, and not from reading or collating Scripture, that men adopt Heretical Opinions; and having once eſpouſed them, they pervert Scriptures to make them appear plauſible: Certainly all miſinterpretations of Scripture proceed from ſome prave diſpoſition, either in the Underſtanding, or Will: And our Saviour made uſe of collating Scripture, *Matth.* 4. as the choiceſt mean to confute ſophiſtical arguings from Scripture. Is there any of the groſs inferences of *Arrians*, *Neſtorians*, *Manichees*, *&c.* which Fathers, and latter Divines, have not confuted by Scripture? Doth not Popery drive this Pamphleter to a great height of Blaſphemy, when he dares affirm, *that an* Arrian *Cobler impugning the Tranſubſtantiality of the Son of God with the Father, cannot be confuted by the Scripture?* Does he mean, that a Jeſuit transfiguring himſelf into the ſhape of a Cobler, (as ſome are ſaid to have done, for indeed they can turn themſelves to all ſhapes) hath learned ſuch dexterity from *Lucifer*, as to maintain the blaſphemous Hereſie of *Arrians?* Let him try his Acumen in anſwering the Scriptural Arguments which *Bell.* hath brought to prove the Conſubſtantiality of the Son of God, *lib.* 1. *de Chriſto*, from *cap.* 4. to 9. inclusive. Did not the Ancient Chriſtian Church confute *Arrians*, *Neſtorians*, *Eutychians*, *&c.* from the holy Scripture? How weak is that inference of the *Arrian*, mentioned by the Pamphleter, *that becauſe Chriſt prayed that his Diſciples might be one*, Joh. 17. *therefore to conclude, that he and the Father are one, only in will and affection?* Do not all the Scriptures which prove the Deity of Chriſt, and that the incommunicable Attributes of the Deity, are applyable to him, demonſtrate him to be Conſubſtantial with the Father? His *other inſtance* is no leſs ridiculous, *from the* Eutychians *concluding, that the Humane Nature of Chriſt is changed into the Divine, becauſe, as its ſaid*, Joh. 1. *the Word was made Fleſh; ſo its ſaid*, Joh. 2. *that the Water was turned into Wine.* If there were any ſtrength in that Argument, would it not rather follow, that the Divine Nature was changed into the Humane? but the truth is, that neither follows: For after that the

Water

Water was made Wine, it retained no more the reciprocal properties of Water; but after that the *Word* was made Fleſh, the Eternal increated Word of God remained the *Word*, as being immutable; and the Fleſh, or his Humane Nature, remained Fleſh: And therefore he deſired the Diſciples *to touch and feel him, that he had fleſh and bones*, Luke 24. 39. Were it proper here for me to digreſs to a confutation of the reſt of thoſe Hereticks mentioned by the Pamphleter, it were as eaſie to ſhew their inferences to be ludibrious, and inconſequential, without the aſſiſtance of any infallible viſible Judge, which the Pamphleter, and all the Romiſh Party, will not be able to do, concerning the Proteſtant Religion. Sure he muſt be either a man of ſtrong fancy, or cauterized Conſcience, who is bold to ſay, *that there cannot be ſo clear Scripture brought againſt the Real Preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament*, (he means their Popiſh Tranſubſtantiated Preſence) *as the old condemned Hereticks brought againſt the Incarnation of Chriſt*: Nay, he ſhall find in its proper place, that their Dream of Tranſubſtantiation may be confuted, not only by other luculent Scriptures, but alſo by theſe words of Chriſt, *This is my Body* (which they apprehend do moſt favour their Cauſe, and which *the Pamphleter ſays are ſpoken by the four Evangeliſts, and by the Apoſtle S. Paul*: but it ſeems he is better acquainted with his Maſs-book, than with the four Evangeliſts; for one of them, namely *S. John*, has not thoſe words) where alſo my argument againſt M. *Demſter*, to this purpoſe, ſhall be vindicated from all his frothy Cavils: I know *Fathers of old did prove the reality of Chriſts Humane Nature againſt* Marcionites, *from his Symbolical Preſence in the Sacrament*; for if Sacramental Bread and Wine be Types, Symbols, and Figures of his Body and Blood, as they are termed by Fathers, then ſurely he had a real Body, and real Blood: But does it from this follow, that they believed a Tranſubſtantiated Preſence? Nay, on the contrary, in as much as the Sacramental Bread and Wine are called by them Types, Figures, and Symbols of his Body and Blood, it appears they held them not to be his very Body and Blood. And here, by the way, I muſt adviſe him, not to expoſe his ignorance to ſuch publick view, as here he doth by citing *S. Chryſoſt. Hom. 6.* as if *Chryſoſt.* had written Homilies but upon one place of Scripture, ſuch Lax Citations will make people ſuſpect, that Jeſuits are not ſo well verſed in the Fathers, as they would make the world believe.

From *pag.* 65. he takes a deal of pains to tranſcribe long Citations out of D. *Jeremy Taylor his liberty of Prophecying*, *Sect.* 4. and he

joyns with him *Osiander* against *Melanction*: It might be enough to tell him, that the first Learned Author was sensible his Book deserved an Apology; it was as fitly entituled, *A liberty of Prophecying*, as the Pamphleters Book, *Scolding without Scholarship*: As the one discovered more scolding, than either sobriety or Scholarship, so the other took more liberty than himself did afterwards allow. *Quisque suos patimur manes.* It appears by the Preface to his Polemicks, that in the mentioned Treatise, he disputed the more sceptically, to make his Adversaries less confident of their Opinions, and consequently more tender to himself, and others of his perswasion. Whether the end proposed will legitimate the mean, Casuists may determine. A further Answer to D. *Taylours Testimony*, I leave to be got from D. *Shirman*; for to him also this testimony of D. *Taylor* was objected by *F. Johnson*, *cap.* 4. *num.* 23. only I add, that D. *Taylor*, notwithstanding all his Sceptical discourse in that Treatise, demonstrates *Sect.* 1. the Scripture to be clear in Fundamentals, which he supposes to be comprised in the Apostolick Creed; and he brings *Sect.* 6, 7. sufficient evidence against the Romish Infallibility both of Pope and Council: How solidly doth the same D. *Taylor* in his Tractate of the Real Presence of Christ in the holy Sacrament, by conferring of Scriptures, confute their imaginary transubstantiated Presence in the Sacrament? What should I mention the wounds he hath given to their whole Cause in his dissuasives, I am little concerned in the testimony alledged from *Osiander* against *Melanction*, for it's but too well known, that *Andreas Osiander*, of whom I suppose the Pamphleter speaks, did unhappily ingage himself in some Paradoxal Debates with his own Brethren: Neither can his own Son, *Lucas Osiander*, in *Epit. Hist. Eccles. Cent.* 16. *pag.* 554. deny it: And what if his over-eager pursuit of those Paradoxal Notions did drive him upon some unadvised expressions, concerning the interpretation of holy Scriptures? can the Pamphleter maintain all the expressions which have dropt from those of their own Party? I doubt if he can name one Controversie betwixt them and us, concerning which they are not subdivided among themselves. how then can he rationally demand of me to defend every thing that hath fallen from the Pen of a Paradoxal *Lutheran*, whose Heterodoxies have been noted by those of his own Party? Did I not signifie in my tenth Paper against M. *Demster*, *pag.* 218, 219. that it's the Reformed Religion, agreed upon by the Protestant Churches in the harmony of their confessions, which I defend, and hope to make good, not only against

such

ſuch a Scribler as this Pamphleter, but alſo againſt the whole Conclave of *Rome*.

His digreſſion *concerning a private ſpirit*, from *pag.* 69. to 72. being wholly impertinent, I judge unworthy of an Anſwer: How oft have Proteſtants declared to the world, they build not their Faith on private Enthuſiaſms, or ſecret objective Revelations? This they leave to Quakers, and to the Romiſh infallible viſible Judge, who having no external infallible Rule to walk by, muſt proceed upon theſe: But the Rule of our Faith, is the publick external teſtimony of the Spirit in the Scriptures. If under a pretence of *excluding a private ſpirit*, he excludes a diſcretive judgment, he excludes the uſe of Reaſon, which Faith always preſuppoſes; nor if he exclude the neceſſity of the Spirits aſſiſtance, by way of an efficient cauſe for aſſenting to Divine Truths recorded in Scripture, he turns *Pelagian*, and contradicts his own Authors, who are conſtrained to acknowledge it. As for any further uſe *of a private ſpirit*, I had almoſt ſaid of a Familiar: when he hath cleared his Popes, and infallible Judges of it, we ſhall be near a ſettlement, as to that thing. An excellent and large account of the teſtimony of the Spirit, what it is, and how far it is neceſſary to the belief of the Scriptures, as alſo of the intrinſick evidence of the Scriptures, is given by the Learned *Amyrald* in *Theſ. Salmur. loc. de teſtimonio Spiritus Sancti.* See alſo *loc. de Author. Script.*

From *pag.* 72. he falls upon the *Queſtion of the Judge of Controverſies*, wherein whether he doth not diſcover *both foul and fooliſh work*, as he is pleaſed to object to me, *pag.* 14. the Reader may judge: Firſt then he ſays, *Scripture cannot be the Judge of Controverſies, as M. Menzies will have.* Let all the Papers betwixt M. *Denſter* and me be read, and it ſhall not be found, that ever I aſſerted the Scripture to be Judge of Controverſies: Indeed, I do aſſert the Scripture to be the Ground and Rule of Faith; and I ſuppoſe when Proteſtants affirm the Scripture to be Judge of Controverſies, they mean no more. But becauſe I knew how apt Papiſts are to cavil upon the term *Judge*, I did ever purpoſely wave it: But this is the Jeſuitical Candour he hath uſed in all his Criminations againſt me.

The Genius of this Scribler will yet more appear, by his ſtating of this Queſtion betwixt Romaniſts and us, *pag.* 75. which he propounds thus; *Catholick Romans*, ſaith he, *build their belief upon Scripture, not taken as they fancy, but as explained by Apoſtolical Tra-*

*dition, conserved in the Church, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers; and if any doubt arise of both these, on the general definition and decision of the present Catholick Church: But Protestants (*says he*) (as M. Menzies holds) ground their Faith on Scripture which they have corrected, or rather corrupted, as clear in it self, or made clear by diligent reading, and conferring of places, with prayers, and (as they imagine) a well-disposed mind, that is a prejudicate Opinion.* It is hard to say whether he discover more perverseness of folly, in representing the state of this question: Take these few observes upon it. And first, if Romanists build their Faith *upon the Scriptures, as expounded by Traditions, &c.* then Scripture contains all Doctrines of Faith, and Traditions serve only to expound the Scripture: And yet he affirms, *pag. 62. There be Articles of Faith, such as Persons in the Trinity, Sacraments in the Church, &c. which he denies to be found in Scripture.* Either then, in this state of the question, he does not declare the adequate ground of the Popish Faith, and so sophisticates with his Reader, when he would make him believe that they build all their Faith on Scripture, or else contradicts both himself, and the current of Romish Doctors, who maintain unwritten Traditions, not only for expounding Scriptures, but also for confirming Articles of Faith not contained in the Scripture. Secondly, He dare not commit the explication of Scripture either to Tradition, or the unanimous consent of Fathers; and therefore he keeps *the definition of the present Church* as a Reserve, in *case of doubts concerning these*, and of *doubts which may be moved concerning the sense of Traditions, and of the testimonies of Fathers.* And therefore all must be ultimately resolved on the definition of the present *Church*, they mean the Popish Church: So that when all comes to all, their Faith is built upon the word of their Pope, or Council, for nothing else can he mean by their *present Church.* But thirdly, seeing the decisions of Faith are remitted *unto the present Church*, that is, Pope or Council, when the case is dubious concerning the sense of Scriptures, Traditions, and Fathers; what is now left to be a ground for the Churches definition, but either Enthusiasm, or a Fancy? So that by this very state of the question, when its well pondered, the ground of the belief of the present Romish Church, is because she fancies so. Fourthly, In this state of the question, he speaks as if Romanists were all agreed concerning the Rule of Faith, or Judge of Controversies; the contrary whereof is apparent from what we spake, both in the former question concerning the infallible visible Judge, and also here concerning

cerning the Rule of Faith. Are M. *Woite*, M. *Serjeant*, M. *Holden*, *Ruſhworth*, and other Patrons of the Traditionary way, of the ſame Opinion, touching the Rule of Faith, and Judge of Controverſies with Jeſuits? Fifthly, Doth he not repreſent us as building our Faith on *corrupted Scriptures?* Is not this an evidence of a moſt deſperate Cauſe, when we muſt be ſo perfidiouſly repreſented? So far are Proteſtants from building on corrupted Scriptures, that we appeal to the pure Originals, and decline no mean for finding out the ſenſe of Scripture ever acknowledged by the Catholick Church. Yea, to cut off their Cavils of this kind, Learned Proteſtants, as M. *Baxter*, *Key for Catholicks*, *Part.* 1. *cap.* 31. have offered to diſpute the Controverſies of Religion out of the Vulgar Latin, or out of the *Rhemiſts* Tranſlation. Sixthly, He would imply, *that we had no regard to Tradition, or to the conſent of Fathers.* In this he belyes us egregiouſly: We are ſo far from excluding them from the means of expounding Scripture, that we have a Venerable eſteem of them, when a Tradition is truly found to have been received by the whole Catholick Church in all Ages, and when Fathers do unanimouſly conſent in Doctrines of Faith: But we muſt have further Evidence for an univerſally and perpetually received Tradition or Doctrine unanimouſly approved by Fathers, then the partial teſtimony of the preſent particular and Apoſtate Church of *Rome*. Dare Romaniſts remit the Controverſies betwixt them and us to thoſe Teſts of Apoſtolick Tradition, or unanimous conſent of Fathers? Have they Apoſtolick Tradition for their Adoration of Images, Invocation of departed Saints, ſubſtraction of the Cup from the people, Purgatory Fire, their Divine Authority of Apocryphal Book, the Supremacy of the Pope above Councils and Princes, *&c.* none but either an Ignorant, or he whoſe Conſcience is Venal and Mercenary, can affirm it: But I may give a more particular account of theſe hereafter. I add but a ſeventh Note, When he mentions the means which we affirm ought to be uſed for finding out the true ſenſe of Scripture, ſuch as the conferring of places of Scripture and prayer (which I ſuppoſe none but an Infidel can diſallow) he reckons forth *a well-diſpoſed mind*, which he interprets *a prejudicate Opinion.* What Candour I have met with, or am to expect from them, let any judge, by this their Commentary upon my words, when I require a well-diſpoſed mind to the right underſtanding of the Scriptures; that is, ſaith my Adverſary, a prejudicate Opinion: Doth he not diſcover himſelf to be a perſon to which his own *Apocrypha* Text *Sup.* 1. 4.

In

In animam malevolam non introibit Sapientia, may most fitly be applyed.

Pag. 73. He flourishes with an old Argument *against the Scriptures being Judge of Controversies*: *The Judge of Controversie*, saith he, *ought to give a clear sentence, which the learned and unlearned may equally understand, but thus doth not the Scripture, and to this purpose*: He alledges *some testimonies from S.* Ambrose, *S.* Austin, *that there be wonderful depths in Scripture*; *and from* Vincentius Lyrinensis, *that Hereticks, such as* Novatus, Sabellius, Arrius, &c. *have put various interpretations upon Scripture*. To this I answer first, *Non infertur Elenchus*, though all this were granted, it only proves that Scripture is not the Judge of Controversies, which is not asserted by me; neither is it otherwise asserted by Protestants, then as the Law is said to be a Judge. Hence was that of *Aristotle Polit. lib.* 4. *cap.* 4. δεῖγαρ τὸν μὲν νόμον ἄρχειν πάντων, the Scripture is only termed Judge, because its the Law of the Supreme Judge, having an Authoritative Power binding upon the Conscience, and it's honoured with the Title of a *Judge*, both in Scripture and in the writings of Fathers, Joh. 8. 48. *The word that I have spoken shall judge him.* Joh. 7. 59. *Doth our Law judge any man, said* Nicodemus, *before it hear him?* Hence S. *Basil Epist.* 80. *ad Eustach.* ἡ θεόπνευστος ἡμῖν διαιτησάτω γραφὴ, and S. *Austin de gr. & lib. arb. cap.* 18. *Sedeat inter nos Judex Apostolus Joannes.* But all this is only so to be understood, that it's the Law and sentence of the Supreme Judge. I answer secondly by retorsion: As many Hereticks put divers senses upon Scripture, neither will they acknowledge themselves to be condemned thereby; so are there divers and contrary senses put by Romanists upon the definitions of their pretended infallible Judge; neither will any of them acknowledg, that their sentiments are condemned by the Pope or Council: I could make a Volum of instances of this nature, I only pitch on two. And first the Council of *Trent* has defined, *Sess.* 4. *cap.* 2. that the Vulgar Latin Version of the Bible be held as Authentick, and that none presume to reject it upon whatsoever pretext. *Habeatur pro Authentica & quod eam nemo rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat.* Is this definition of the Council clear either to learned or unlearned? Knows he not the interminable debates of Romanists concerning the sense of this definition? Doth not *Azorius* the Jesuit *Tom.* 1. *Moral. lib.* 8. *cap.* 3. testifie, that *Andreas Vega, Andradius, Sixtus Senensis, Melchior Canus*, and *Lindanus* maintain, that the Council of *Trent* intended not to vindicate the Vulgar

Version

Verſion from all errours, either of Tranſcribers, or of the Interpreter himſelf, but only from groſs errours relating to Faith and Manners. To theſe *Calvius crit. ſac. de Vulgatæ Verſionis Authoritate minimè Authentica. Sect.* 143. adds *Driedo*, *Mariana*, *Iſidore Clarius*, *Brugenſis*, *Jodocus*, *Ravenſtein*, but others as *Azorius* himſelf *loc. cit. Lud de Tena in Iſagog. ad ſcript. lib.* 1. *difficul.* 6. *cap.* 1. *&* 3. *Pine ad præfat. in Eccleſiaſt. cap.* 15. *Sect.* 2. *Greiſer defenſ. Bell. lib.* 2. *de verb. Dei cap.* 11. and many others hold, that the Vulgar Verſion is not tainted with the leaſt errours; and this Debate was proſecuted with ſuch animoſity, that as *Calvius* reports *Sect.* 143. out of *Mariana*, they impeached one another before Judicatories with mutual Criminations, and a Congregation of Cardinals was delegated to explain the ſenſe of the Council, yet neither to this day is that Debate finiſhed. Take another inſtance from the Bull of Pope *Innocent* the Tenth, againſt the five Propoſitions of *Janſenius*, which the Jeſuits apprehend to be wholly in their favours; and yet what various ſenſes are impoſed thereon by the *Janſeniſts*, may appear from the Diſquiſitions of *Paulus Irenæus*, ſubjoyned to the Notes of *Wendrokius* upon the Provincial Letters at *Helmſtad*, *Anno* 1664. Hence it follows, that if various ſenſes impoſed upon the ſentence of a Judge, conclude that the giver of thoſe ſentences is not the Judge of Controverſies, then both Pope and Council are alike to be degraded from being Judges. I anſwer therefore thirdly, That its enough that the Supreme Judge give out Law ſo clear, that all Subjects might underſtand his ſentences, if the diſability be not from themſelves: And ſuch are the Scriptures of God, though the prejudices of Infidel Jews will not let them underſtand that *Jeſus* is the *Meſſiah*, doth it therefore follow, that the Scriptures have not clearly declared him to be the *Meſſiah?* or if *Ebionites* and *Arrians* will not acknowledge Chriſt to be God, doth it follow he is not there revealed to be the true God? or if *Socinians* will not acknowledge him to have ſatisfied Divine Juſtice, is it not therefore clearly enough revealed in Scripture? The Pamphleter ſpends Paper in vain, to prove *the conſiſteney of the Law with a Judge*; for that is not denied by Proteſtants, we acknowledge that Councils have a Judiciary Power, and that the general ſentences of Scripture may be applyed by them for determining particular Controverſies: But that which is in queſtion is, whether Pope or Council have an infallible aſſiſtance, whereof we muſt anteeedently be aſcertained, before we believe any Divine Truth. This the Pamphleter ſhould have proved, but that here he doth not once touch.

Page

Page 77. The Pamphleter raiſes no little duſt with *ſome Citations of* D. Field, eſpecially in his *lib.* 4. *cap.* 14, 18, 19. *as if he aſſerted the conſenting judgment of them that went before us to be the Rule of Faith, and not the conferring of places, nor looking to the Originals, and that never any Proteſtant taught otherwiſe; for which the Pamphleter would excommunicate me from the Proteſtant Churches.* But who authorized him to declare who be Proteſtants, and who not, *Ne ſutor ultra crepidam:* Is there a ſyllable in all my Papers derogating from the due eſteem of Fathers? Did I not ſtill offer to debate the truth of our Religion from Antiquity, as well as Scripture? Did I not conclude their Religion ſpurious, becauſe it differs in its Eſſentials from the Ancient Church? I appeal all the Order of Jeſuits to let me have an account of Univerſal Tradition for Adoration of Images, half Communions, Apocryphal Scriptures, the Popes Supremacy, the neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge, &c. How ſcurvily is D. *Field* dealt with by theſe men? Does not the Doctor complain, *Append. ad lib.* 5. *Part.* 2. *Sect.* 5. that for what he had written concerning the Rule of Faith, he was cenſured by Romaniſts as framing a new Religion for Sir *Thomas Mores Utopia*; yet this Pamphleter, on the other hand, makes theſe Aſſertions of D. *Field* to be the Standard of the Proteſtant Religion: It is a falſhood, *that* D. Field *makes conſent with thoſe who went before us to be the only Rule of Faith, or the* ſine quo non *for interpreting of Scripture*: for *lib.* 4. *cap.* 14. he reckons forth ſeven Rules of Faith, and that comes but in towards the Rear. Again, in *cap.* 19. he enumerates ſeven means for finding out the ſenſe of Scripture; among which, the knowledge of Original Tongues, and conferring Texts, are not omitted. Yea, *cap.* 17. he poſitively aſſerts with *Cajetan, Andradius, Janſenius, Maldonat*, that in interpretation of Scripture, we may go contrary to the torrent of Antiquity; and he concludes them highly unthankful to God, who will deny that in this laſt Age the true ſenſe of ſundry Texts of Scripture is found out. It's too groſs a Cheat which the Pamphleter would put upon his Reader, wherewith the paſſages cited concerning the Rule of Faith, the conferring of Scripture, and conſulting the Originals, he adds theſe words, *that never did any Proteſtant teach otherwiſe*; whereas D. *Field* ſubjoyns them in another *Sect.* to a ſentence of *Illiricus*. But let him make what he will of D. *Field*'s teſtimony, dare Romaniſts own all the Aſſertions of *Gerſon, Cajetan, Caſſander, Clemanges, Picherell, Eſpencæus*, &c. who were famous men in the Latin Church; if they dare, they muſt condemn the preſent

Syſtem

Syſtem of the Romiſh Faith; if they dare not, why then preſs they me with ſingular Aſſertions of D. *Field*, or D. *Taylor*; ought they not to deal as they would be dealt with?

Pag. 79. He cites a Relation of *Reſcius de Atheiſmo*, *that in the ſpace of* 60 *years there were* 60 *Synods all agreeing on the Scripture as the Rule, yet parted without concordance.* *Anſw.* If this be that *Staniſlaus Reſcius* mentioned by *Poſſevin in apparat.* he appears by his Book entituled *Miniſtro-Machia*, to be a malevolous perſon, and conſequently not worthy of credit: But though the truth of the relation were admitted, yet it derogates nothing from the Scriptures being the Rule of Faith; it only ſpeaks forth either the weakneſs of mens judgments, or the ſtrength of their paſſions. Does not *Nazianzen* complain, that in his time he had never ſeen the good iſſue of any Synod? yet then the Controverſie was not of the Rule of Faith, but of material objects of Faith. Though Romaniſts pretend to have advantages for terminating Controverſies by their infallible viſible Judge, yet have they not been able to terminate the debates of *Jeſuits* and *Dominicans de gratia*, or of *Franciſcans* and *Dominicans* concerning the Conception of the Virgin *Mary*, or betwixt *Moliniſts* and *Janſeniſts*: How many debates have been at the Court of *Rome* about theſe things, and yet the diſſentions are as wide as ever. Themſelves therefore muſt confeſs, that the continuance of debates doth not always reflect upon the Rule of Faith, but often flow from mens intereſts, or prejudicate Opinions.

Towards the cloſe of that page he cites a paſſage from *Tertullian*, *lib. de præſcript.* which ſounds very harſhly, *That in diſputing out of Texts of Scripture there is no good got, but either to make a man ſick, or mad.* What if I ſhould do as *Bell. lib.* 1. *de Chriſto cap.* 9. *lib.* 4. *de Pontif. cap.* 8. and *lib.* 1. *de Beat. Sanct. cap.* 5. who rejects *Tertullians* teſtimony, when it makes againſt him, as of an Heretick and *Montaniſt*? yet I will not be ſo briſk. That Golden Book of Preſcriptions was written by him, before he turned *Montaniſt*: And as *Davenant* ſays, *de Jud. controverſ. cap.* 8. *totus noſter eſt*, is wholly for us; for in it he overturns the Foundation of Popiſh unwritten Traditions; namely, that though the Apoſtles preached unto all, things that are neceſſary to be believed, yet there were ſome ſecret myſteries which they delivered only to ſome that were more perfect. This Tenet now owned by Papiſts: *Tertullian* charges upon Hereticks, *cap.* 25 *Confitentur Apoſtolos nihil ignoraſſe, nec diverſa inter ſe prædicaſſe, ſed non omnia voluit illis omnibus revelaſſe, quædam palam*

& universis, quædam secreto & paucis demandasse: And in confutation of them, *cap.* 27. he subjoyns, *Incredibile est vel ignorasse Apostolos plenitudinem prædicationis, vel non omnem ordinem Regulæ omnibus edidisse.* If you then ask what meant *Tertullian* by the words cited in the *Objection*: *Answ.* He is speaking of Hereticks, who either did reject the Scriptures, or did mutilate and corrupt them, or did recur to unwritten Traditions; and therefore immediately after the words cited by the Pamphleter, *Tertullian* adds, *cap.* 17. *Ista Hæresis non recipit quasdam Scripturas, & si quas recipit adjectionibus & detractionibus ad dispositionem instituti sui invertit.* I confess there is little profit in arguing against such from Scripture: We do not argue from Scripture against Infidels, who deny Scripture. *Tertullian* therefore is speaking of such Hereticks, who are not to be admitted to Disputation, which *lib.* 1. *cont. Marcion. cap.* 1. he calls *Retractatus*, but with whom prescription is to be used: Now Prescription signifies a Legal Exception, whereby an Adversary is kept off from *Litis-contestation*. Had *Tertullian* universally condemned arguing against Hereticks from Scripture as folly and madness, he had convicted himself of this evil, who argues so frequently from Scripture: Yea, *lib. de carne Christi cap.* 7. he is so peremptory as to say, *Non recipio quod extra Scripturam de tuo infers*; and *lib. de Resur. carnis cap.* 3. *Auser Hæreticis quæ cum Ethnicis sapiunt ut de Scripturis solis quæstiones suas statuant & stare non possunt.* Well might *Tertullian*, who lived a little after the Apostles, Appeal to the Doctrine of Apostolick Churches, the Doctrine having been till that time preserved pure in them: But now the case is greatly altered, after the succession of so many Ages, all these Apostolick Churches have been stained with Errours, by the acknowledgment of the Roman, except her self, and others are ready to affirm no less of her, and perhaps upon as solid ground: Yet when *Tertullian* appeals to Apostolick Churches, he enumerates *cap.* 36. the Churches of *Corinth*, *Philippi*, *Thessalonica* and *Ephesus*, no less than the Roman, so that he attributes no more Authority to her, than to others.

Lastly, *pag.* 80. after he had repeated what had been examined in the former Section, *that Religion was before Scripture:* He asks, *if Protestants be assured by Scriptures of what they believe, why may not Romanists also, seeing they likewise read Scripture, pray, and confer places; are more numerous, acute, learned, want Wives, work Miracles, and convert Nations.* Here be very big words, *Sesqui-pedalia verba*: But may not I first use retorsion thus; Are Romanists perswaded from

from Fathers, Councils, or Traditions, of what they believe? Why then may not Protestants, who read Fathers and Councils as well as they, and search after those things which are conveyed by Universal Tradition; and I hope Protestants are not contemptible, either for number or learning (though we do not restrict the Catholick Church to those who go under the denomination of Protestants) and besides, our Doctrinal principles have an eminent tendency to Holiness. May not *Jansenists* and *Dominicans* say, they submit their Doctrine to an infallible Judge, as well as Jesuits; that they read and consider the Bulls and Definitions of Popes as well as Jesuits? why then should not they be as capable to find the true sense of these Bulls and Definitions as Jesuits? Yea, might not Heathens have used this Argument against the Ancient Apostolick Churches, for the number of Heathens were greater, and their Learning not inferiour, nor wanted they pretended Miracles? Doth not this retorsion discover the frothiness of these Topical Rhetorications? But secondly, these vain Clamours may be sufficiently confuted with that word of our Saviour, *Matth.* 11. 25. and that of the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 1. 20. *Where is the Wise? Where is the Scribe? Where is the Disputer of this World? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this World?* And ver. 26, 27. *Ye see your Calling Brethren, how that not many wise men, &c.* Is there any Society in the World, among whom there be more politick carnal interests to byass the judgments of men, than in the Romish Church? Are there not many secular advantages to entice men of acute parts to improve their faculties to support the Papacy? Are not Romanists also armed with Power to terrifie and affright those that would whisper against them? What severities have been exercised by their Inquisition to keep up their interest? Hath not Popish *Rome* exceeded Heathenish *Rome* in her Cruelty.

Quid tale immanes unquam gessisse feruntur
Vel Schinis isthmiaca pinus, vel rupe profunda
Sciron, vel Phalaris tauro, vel carcere Sylla?
O Mites Diomedis equi, Busiridis aræ
Clementes, tu Cinna Pius, tu Spartace lenis
Romanis Collatus eris.

Are they not addebted to Protestants for much of their Learning? What gross ignorance did cover the World till the Reformation? Though Romish Priests have not Wives, yet want they Concubines, Nephews, or Nieces? What differ their pretended Miracles from the lying Signs and Wonders spoken of 2 *Thes.* 2. 9. Are they at pains

to Proselyte others? Did not the *Pharisees* so? Yet I should be loath to blame their Zeal in that, if they were not more zealous for the Romish Interest, than for the common concerns of Christianity. But is it not evident that they have abused the World by Romantick Fictions, as Histories of real Conversions? At this time, that one instance may suffice of the marvellous History of the *Capucin Lesly*, which I had in French from an excellent and learned person, D. *Ludovick Gordon*, M. D. a Son of the Renowned Family of *Stralough*, who also in regard of my unskilfulness in the French Tongue, was at the pains to draw up an Epitome of the said History in English out of the French. This History passes so current in *Italy* and *France*, that it is translated from the Italian Tongue to the French by the Prince *de Ferme*, and is approved by Doctors of the Faculty of *Paris*; *F. Ives Pinford*, and *F. Charles Thebault*: And the wonderful Conversions by the *Capucin* have been objected to Protestant Gentlemen travelling in *Italy*, as some of themselves have related, not only to me, but also to others. I shall not trouble the Reader with all the ludibrious Fictions concerning that *Capucin*, as that he was the Son of Count *Lesly*, Baron of *Torrie* and *Monimusk*, or concerning the description of *Monimusk*, as a great City, &c. I only notice that there its related, that this *Capucin* should have converted 4000 to the Romish Faith, betwixt *Monimusk* and *Aberdene*: If their 100000 converted in *China*, and the *Indies*, be like the 4000 converted at *Aberdene* and *Monimusk*, they may be Inhabitants for Sir *Thomas More's Utopia*: Let the Inhabitants of *Aberdene* judge by this notorious untruth what Faith is to be given to Romish Legends. This brings to my mind a passage of the Author of the History of Cardinals, *Part* 1. *lib.* 2. *pag.* 61. *Upon the day* (saith he) *that is dedicated to S.* Francis Xaverius, *in the presence of four or five Cardinals, and in* Rome *it self, I heard a Jesuit preach in the praise of that Saint; among the rest of his Elogies, this was one, that he had baptized a million, and a hundred and eight thousand Souls in the* Indies: But, saith the Author, *I am of opinion he scarce baptized any, and my reason is, because at this time there is not one hundred thousand Christians in all the* Indies: *So that had it been true that* Xaverius *had baptized so many, the number would have been encreased, especially the way having been open, since that time, to the* Spaniard, Portugal, English, Hollander, *and all Christians whatsoever*: By which it may be evident, that the more prudent among themselves are sensible how they cheat the World with Romances. But to shut up this Chapter, if Romanists have

more

more knowledge of the Scriptures than we, why are they ſo afraid to have Controverſies decided by Scripture? Why ſuffer they not their people to uſe the Scripture? Were it but for the indignities which they put upon the holy Scripture, and for ſetting up a Pope as Head of the Catholick Church, and his Definitions as the Rule of Faith, is it not juſt with God to give them up to ſtrong deluſions to believe lyes?

CAP. IV.

A Diſcourſe of Fundamentals, with ſome Reflections on the Contradictions, Impertinencies, and Falſhoods of the Romiſh Pamphleter in his Sect. 5.

THe Pamphleter in the inſcription of his *Sect.* 5. *pag.* 83. inſinuates, *that the Fundamentals of Religion are clearly revealed in Scripture*; yet *pag.* 99, and 102. he diſputes with all the force he can, *that there be Fundamentals not at all contained in Scripture*: So skilled is he in contradicting himſelf.

There is nothing which ſtartles Modern Romaniſts more, than the diſtinction of Fundamentals and non-Fundamentals, or Eſſentials and Integrals in Religion: Nor can *I* ſee any other reaſon, but becauſe the diſtinction, when its clearly penetrated, and well improved, doth diſcover the Schiſmatical and imperious uſurpation of the Church of *Rome*, and contributes exceedingly to the clearing of the Unity of the Catholick Church, notwithſtanding of the differences that may be among particular Churches; whereas the Church of *Rome*, like that Gyant *Procruſtes*, would be excluding all from the Catholick Church, who do not in all things come up to her meaſure: I hope therefore, it may be of ſome uſe, to unfold a little of the nature of this diſtinction.

But firſt I muſt take ſome notice of an invidious repreſentation of the diviſions of Proteſtants, concerning the number of Fundamentals, made by the Pamphleter *pag.* 84. *Some*, ſays he, *ſuppoſe them to be contained in the Creed, ſome in the Decalogue, ſome in the Lords Prayer, ſome in all joyntly; ſome to theſe add the Sacraments.* Had he looked homeward, he might have found that which would have

made

made him lay his hand on his mouth: Can they agree among themſelves, how many Articles are neceſſary, *neceſſitate medii*, to be explicitly believed? Do they not altercate among themſelves, whether now in the dayes of the Goſpel, it be neceſſary, to believe the Trinity, and the Myſtery of the Incarnation? Is not the negative maintained by *Medina*, *Vega Zumel*, *Suarez*, *Turrian*, *Hurtado*, *Lorca*, all whom *Lugo* both cites and follows *Tract. de fide, diſp.* 12. *Sect.* 4. *N.* 91. although they be contradicted by *Melchior Canus*, *Ledeſma*, *Caſtro*, *Bannez*, &c. as the ſame *Lugo* acknowledgeth, *N.* 88. Do they not diſpute among themſelves, if it be neceſſary to believe any thing explicitely? Does not *Azor Tom.* 1. *Inſtit. Moral. lib.* 8. *cap.* 6. *qu.* 1. bring in *Directo* and *Reſſel* maintaining, that its enough to believe what the Church believes, though explicitely nothing in particular be believed? Yet herein alſo they are contradicted by *Sylvius*, *Navarr.* and *Azorius* himſelf. Can the Pamphleter give an inventory of all, that their Church hath ſo impoſed under pain of Anathema's, as to make Fundamentals to her Diſciples? How then have theſe men a face, to challenge others of their diviſions, about the number of Fundamentals? Had the Pamphleter conſidered the diſtinction betwixt *credenda*, *facienda*, *petenda*, he would have ſeen theſe forementioned ſeeming difficulties among Proteſtants were not ſo hard to be reconciled. If one ſaid the Creed contains *ſummum credendorum*, the Decalogue, *faciendorum*, and the Lords Prayer, *petendorum*. If ſome have reduced the Sacraments to an Article of the Creed, *inter credenda*, others to a Precept of the Decalogue *inter facienda*, the contrariety is not ſo great as the Pamphleter would inſinuate. Neither do all Perſons take the word *Fundamental* in the ſame reſtrictive ſenſe. Hence *Paræus* in *Irenico cap.* 29. after he had branched forth the Fundamentals into four heads, the Decalogue, the Creed, Lords Prayer, and Sacraments, ſubjoyns *in his ipſis tamen Capitibus, ciſe rimen aliquod eſſe poſſe libenter etiam conceſſerimus, nam alia aliis magis vel minus ad ſalutem ſunt neceſſaria.*

To reduce the Pamphleters diſorderly diſcourſe of Fundamentals into ſome method, I ſhall briefly enquire into theſe eight things. 1. Whether there be ground for the diſtinction of Fundamentals, or Non Fundamentals, or of Eſſentials and Integrals in Religion? 2. Whether all Fundamentals be clearly contained in Scripture? 3. Whether every thing which the Church impoſes to be believed as an Article of Faith, become on that very account a Fundamental? 4. Whether there was a neceſſity of determining the preciſe number

ber of Fundamentals, for decision of the controversie betwixt Mr. *Dempster* and the Author? 5. Whether the Popish Religion be injurious to the Fundamentals of Christianity? 6. Whether the *Waldenses*, *Wickleviists*, and *Hussites* were of the same Religion as to Fundamentals with Protestants? 7. Whether do the Greek Churches agree with Protestants as to Fundamentals, 8. Whether the Religion of Protestants be openly against Gods Word, and contrary to the Fundamentals of Christianity, as the Pamphleter does alledge?

SECT. I.

Whether there be ground for the distinction of Fundamentals *and* Non-Fundamentals, *or of* Essentials *and* Integrals *in* Religion.

THat there be no logomachy concerning the subject of the present Dispute, I shall seek no other description of a Fundamental Verity in Religion, than that which the Pamphleter gives *page* 90. *It is*, saith he, *either that which makes us believe all the rest, or without the express knowledge and belief thereof, none can be saved.* Now this being the notion of Fundamental Truth, I conceive it cannot be asserted rationally, that all Truths of the Christian Religion are Fundamental. If by Fundamental be understood, that for which other Articles are to be believed, then sure we must suppose, there be other particulars which are believed for that. As there is a formal Object and Rule of Faith, so there are distinct material Objects of Faith. If therefore a Fundamental and the formal Object or Rule of Faith, which is the reason for which the rest are believed, be one and the same, then as many material Objects as there be in Christianity, there be as many Non-Fundamentals. If you take a Fundamental for that, without the explicite belief whereof none can be saved, I am sure likewise, there be many Non-Fundamentals in Religion. Else the Romish implicite Collier, and all who walk in his Footsteps, as do the plurality of their Communion, must be damned eternally. If all Truths of the Christian Religion were of absolute necessity to Salvation, and Fundamentals, what meant the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 3. 11, 12. to distinguish betwixt the Foundation, and Gold, Silver, and Precious Stones built thereupon? There be then precious Truths built upon the Foundation, which yet are not the Foundation. Or what meant the Author to the Hebrewes *cap.* 6. *v.* 1. by that foundation

of

of Repentance from dead Works, and of Faith toward God, when he is quickening them to purſue after other Truths? If all Articles of Faith be Fundamental, and the explicite belief thereof abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation, than who ever did live or die in any error of Religion were damned eternally. What then ſhould become of the believing multitude of whom ſaid S. *Auſtin lib. cont. Epiſt. Fundam. cap. 4. Turbam non intelligendi vivacitas ſed credendi ſimplicitas tutiſſimam facit*, and ſo may be obnexious to many errours in Religion. But what ſpeak I of the Multitude? What did become of all the Fathers, who were leavened with the Millenary error, of whom an account may be received from *Sixtus Senenſis lib. 5. Bibl. annot.* 233. and *lib. 6. annot.* 347. or of the Fathers who denyed that the Souls of Juſt men are admitted to the beatifique Viſion before the day of Judgement, of whom a Liſt may be had from *Senenſis lib. 6. Bibl. Annot.* 345. What did become of *Tertullian, Cyprian, Firmilian, Deny's* of *Alexandria*, who maintained rebaptization? What became of *Auſtine, Innocent* the 1. and others, who, as *Maldonat* witneſſes in *John 6.* 53. affirmed the Euchariſt was neceſſary to the ſalvation of Infants? Were all theſe Fathers damned eternally? Surely either the points about which they erred were not Fundamental, or theſe Errors have damned the Fathers of the Church eternally. *Do we not know but in part*, 1 Cor. 13. 9. *Woo can underſtand his Errors*, Pſal. 19. 12. If every Error did plunge men into Damnation, who then could be ſaved.

I know the ordinary reply, *That the Church then had not explicitely declared againſt theſe Errors, and therefore though the Errors concerning the Millenium, the excluſion of Saints from the Beatifique Viſion, Rebaptization, the neceſſity of the Euchariſt, be Hereſies now, in regard of of the declaration of the Church, yet were not in the dayes of the Fathers.* This ſuppoſes another abſurd Error, which I hope *Sect.* 3. to confute, *viz. That the declaration of the Church makes points to be Fundamental*, and conſequently, the baſis falling, the ſuperſtructure cannot ſtand. At preſent I onely argue thus, if theſe points be Fundamental now, which were not in the dayes of the Fathers, than the Chriſtian Religion is not the ſame now which it was, nor make we up one Catholick Church with them. Their Religion and ours differing in Eſſentials. If the Roman Church be that Catholique Church whoſe declaration makes Articles Fundamental, did not the and *Stephen* the Biſhop of *Rome* declare explicitely againſt S. *Cyprian* in the point of Rebaptization? It ſhould therefore follow that St. *Cyprian*,

Cyprian, and the reſt who joyned with him had erred Fundamentally. Yet the Catholick Church holds them for Saints, for *Firmilian* is Sainted in the Calendary of the Greek Church, and *Cyprian* in the Diptychs both of the Eaſtern and Weſtern Church: And therefore theſe errours, notwithſtanding of the Church of *Romes* Declaration, were not Fundamental. It's a diſingenuous evaſion of *Bell. lib. 4. de Pont. cap. 7.* to ſay, that Pope *Stephen* though he witneſſed his diſlike with *Cyprians* Opinion of Rebaptization, yet never declared it an errour contrary to Faith: How then did *Stephen* not only threaten them who perſiſted in it with Excommunication, as *Bell.* does confeſs, but alſo actually ſeclude from his Communion, on the ſame account, *Firmilian* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, and many other Aſiatick Biſhops, as teſtifies *Denys* of *Alexandria* in *Euſeb. lib. 7. cap. 4.* or how did he call *Cyprian* himſelf *Pſeudo Chriſtum, Pſeudo Apoſtolum, doloſum operarium*, a falſe Chriſt, falſe Apoſtle, and deceitful worker, as *Firmilian* records in *Epiſt. ad Cyp.* which is the 75 among *Cyprians* Epiſtles? or how did *Cyprian Epiſt. 74. ad Pompeiam* accuſe *Stephen*, as taking the defence of Hereticks againſt the Church of God, had not the matter in controverſie betwixt them been looked on as an Article of Faith? Ought not Romaniſts at leaſt give the world ſome Characteriſticks, by which to know when the Biſhops of *Rome* define a point to be an Article of Faith, unleſs they deſign to hold all in ſuſpence, that they may improve their *Delphick* Oracles as definitions of Faith, or otherwiſe as they find their intereſt require. But as to *Cyprian*, however he did err in the matter of Rebaptization, yet he well perceived the point not to be Fundamental, but ſuch as good men may differ in, *ſalvo pacis & concordiæ vinculo*, as he expreſſes himſelf *Epiſt. 72. ad Stephanum:* And therefore adds, *qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus.* And for this his moderation he is commended by S. *Auguſtine, Ep. 48.* and by S. *Hierome* in *Dial. adverſus Luciferi.* though they were of a contrary perſwaſion in the thing. Excellently ſaid *Auſtin lib. 1. cont. Julian. cap. 6. Alia ſunt in quibus inter ſe etiam doctiſſimi, atque optimi regulæ Catholicæ defenſores, ſalvâ fidei compage non conſonant, & alius alio de una re melius aliquid dicit & verius, hæc autem unde nunc agimus, ad ipſa pertinet fidei fundamenta.*

Perhaps a Romaniſt may run to that ſubterfuge of the *Valenburgii in examin. princip. fidei exam 3. Sect. 8. That therefore they who hold theſe errours, were of the ſame Religion with them who now believe the contrary, becauſe though they differ in the material objects of their*

Faith, yet the *same* ratio formalis fidei, *or Rule of Faith, was acknowledged by both*; *namely, that whatever God proposes by his Church is to be believed, and by the same reason these Authors would be reconciling the Faith of Romanists before and after the Council of* Trent. They cannot deny but there be things now held as Articles of Faith, which were not so held before the Council of *Trent*, *yet they would have us to believe that the Religion of both is the same, because the* ratio formalis credendi, *or the Rule of Faith, is the same in both*; *namely, what God proposes clearly by his Church*. But here many falshoods are sophistically insinuated. For first, though it be true that whatever God proposes, whether by the Church, or by a private Pastor, ought to be believed, yet the *Valentinians* sophistically insinuate, that whatever the Church proposes, God also proposes, and that as necessary to Salvation, though it were not so before; but that this is a notorious falshood, shall be cleared *Sect.* 3. neither can all the Clergy of *Rome* prove that this was the Faith of the Ancient Church. The Pamphleter made some Essays to this purpose by some broken shreds of Antiquity in his *Sect.* 3. which we have examined *cap.* 2. and shewed that they make nothing for his purpose. Nay, the Ancient Fathers, as we have evicted *cap.* 3. hold, that the Scriptures were the Rule of Faith, and the *ratio formalis credendi* (for in this matter they seem to be taken for one) consequently they differing from Romanists in the Rule of Faith, were not of the same Religion with them. Secondly, it is as notorious a falshood, that Romanists before and after the Council of *Trent*, are agreed upon the same *ratio formalis credendi*, or the same Rule of Faith. Did I not shew the diversities of Opinions among themselves touching this thing, in the stating of the question concerning the Rule of Faith? If this be the prevalent Doctrine of the Romish Church which this Pamphleter holds out, that the definition of an Infallible Judge is the principal Rule of Faith, assuredly there were eminent persons in the Romish Church of another perswasion before the Council of *Trent*; namely, those who maintained that Pope and Council were fallible, such as *Occam*, *Panormitan*, *Petrus de Alliaco*, *Antoninus*, Cardinal *Cusan*, *Nicolaus Iemanges*, of whom I gave an account *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 2. Yea, nor can Romanists, to this day, agree among themselves concerning the Rule of Faith, some holding Oral Tradition, some the definition of a General Council, and others the definition of a Pope to be it, though to hide their differences from simple ones, they endeavour to wrap up all, in some general terms, such as the Proposition of the Church:

Church: yet in expounding these terms, they go by the ears among themselves. Thirdly, there is more requisite to the Unity of Religion, then a mere agreement in the *formalis ratio credendi*, or the Rule of Faith; there be some material objects of Faith, the explicite belief whereof is of absolute necessity to Salvation. Can any be saved, who do not believe an Heaven, and an Hell? Doth not Scripture hold forth Jesus Christ to be a Foundation in Religion, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. Hence D. *Vane* in his lost Sheep, *cap.* 8. *pag.* 87. though he cavil against the distinction of Fundamentals and Non-Fundamentals, yet he is constrained to confess, *that in regard of the material object, or thing to be believed, some points are Fundamentals, others not*; that is, *some points are to be believed explicitly and distinctly, others not.* Consequently its not a sufficient reason to say, such held one *ratio formalis credendi*, therefore were of the same Religion, especially when its confessed there be material objects which are of necessity to salvation to be believed by the one, which were not by the other. Fourthly, the true reason therefore why the Fathers, notwithstanding their errours, were not heretical, but of the same Religion with us, because their errours were only against integrals of Religion, but not against Fundamentals, neither did they pertinaciously maintain them, but were willing to have renounced them, had they been convinced that they were contrary to the Scripture, which to them was the Rule of Faith, as well as to us: So that to them might have been said, as *Austin* to *Vincentius Victor*, *lib.* 3. *de orig. animæ cap.* 15. *Ille animus etiam in dictis per ignorantiam non Catholicus, ipse est correctionis præmeditatione Catholicus*, a Soul maintaining errours contrary to Catholick Doctrine, yet willing to submit upon conviction, upon that virtual repentance or premeditation of correction, to use S. *Austins* word, is truly Catholick, namely, when the Errours strike not at the Foundation, as the same Father spoke in the forecited testimony, *lib.* 1. *contra Julian. cap.* 6.

Against this *the Pamphleter ob. cit.* pag. 92, 93. *many Fathers, S. Athanasius in his Creed, S.* Hierome *lib.* 3. *cont.* Ruffin, Nazianzen *tract. de fide, S.* Basil *in Theod. lib.* 4. *Hist. cap.* 6. *and* Tertull. *lib. de præscript. as if they all had held that an errour in Faith would damn a Soul, and consequently every point of Faith to be Fundamental.* He would do well to look better to his citations hereafter, for *Theod. lib.* 4. *hist. cap.* 6. makes no mention at all of S. *Basil*, but only relates the Ordination of S. *Ambrose*. But to pass this escape, I answer, that Fathers indeed held an errour in Fundamentals of Faith to damn

a Soul, but not one in integrals, especially when it's maintained without pertinacy: That Fathers admitted such a distinction in points of Faith, may be apparent, because they did accuse one another, sometimes of errours in Religion, as S. *Cyprian* was accused by the Bishops of *Rome*, for maintaining Rebaptization as an errour in Religion, and yet him the Catholick Church ever held for a Saint and Martyr. S. *Austin lib.* 3. *de orig. anime cap.* 15. charges *Vitor* with eleven errours contrary to the Catholick Faith, yet had so much charity to him, that he said, *Absit ut arbitreris te hæc opinando à Catholica fide recessisse, quamvis ea fidei adversa sunt Catholicæ*; therefore they held not every point of Faith Fundamental. The severe sentence pronounced in the *Athanasian* Creed (which yet I must advertise the Pamphleter, to be doubted whether it were drawn by the Great *Athanasius*) is only against those who deny any Article of that Creed. Now Creeds of the Ancient Church are supposed by Judicious Divines to contain Fundamentals, as contra-distinguished from integrals: That of *Nazianzen tract. de fide Orat.* 49. relates to *Arrians*, against whom he there disputes, who certainly erred fundamentally, at whom also S. *Hierom Apol.* 3. *contra Ruffinum*, seems to hint for their denying the ὁμοούσιον; and the Pamphleter himself grants that *Tertull.* is speaking against *Valentinus*, whom all know to have erred fundamentally: so that from none of these testimonies can any thing be inferred against this distinction; yet I freely grant, that sometime opposition to an integral of Faith may also damn a soul, namely, when it is joyned with pertinacy; but then it is not the simple not believing of the truth which condemns the man, but his pertinacy.

But, says the Pamphleter, *the English Church Excommunicates them who hold any thing contrary to the* 39 *Articles*; ergo, *they hold all the* 39 *Articles to be Fundamentals.*

Answ. Is it not more safe to judge of the thoughts of the English Church, concerning the 39 Articles, by the writings of eminent Divines in that Church approved by the Church of *England*, then by the topical discourses of a nameless Romanist. Now Learned *Stillingfleet* in his Vindication of the Bishop of *Canterbury* against *T. C. Part.* 1. *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 6. says, *that the Church of* England *never pressed the subscription of the* 39 *Articles, as being all Fundamentals of Faith*; and for this also cites luculent testimonies of Bishop *Bramhall*, Primate of *Ireland*: *She excommunicates them for their pertinacy, and for their breaking of the Peace of the Church, not that she supposes them*

all

all Essentials of Religion. To the like purpose speaks D. *Fern* in his Preface against D. *Champny*; *We acknowledge* (saith he) *that he who shall pertinaciously and turbulently speak and teach against the Doctrine of the Church, in points of lest moment, may deserve to be Anathematized, or put out of the Church; for such a one, though he deny not the Faith, yet makes a breach of Charity, whereby he goes out of the Church, against which he so sets himself.* What the Pamphleter cites of the *Athenian Laws*, savours of *Draco*'s severity, who wrote all his Sanctions in blood, and made every trespass Capital, a fit President for the sanguinary proceedings of the Romish Inquisition. *Josephus lib. 2. cont. Appion.* doth only say, *that the punishment allotted to the Violaters of the Jewish Law, for most part, was death.* If this Romanist be so bloody, that he would have the Gospel Church in this to Judaize, his preposterous Zeal deserves such a rebuke as those who would have commanded fire to come down from Heaven on the Samaritans, *Luke* 9. 54. 55. As for the *angry expressions of* Luther *against them he call'd Sacramentarians*; it's true of him, what was said of *Elias*, *Jam.* 5. 17. that he was a man subject to the like passions with others: Yet that *Luther* before his death was convinced of the truth of our Doctrine concerning the Sacrament. *Bibliander lib. 3. de harm. Eucharist.* proves by many testimonies from *Melanthon*, *Cruciger*, *Alesius*, yea, and out of *Luthers* own writings. As for that heavy sentence, *Revel.* 22. 19. it holds forth what *de Jure* is due to all who derogate any thing from the sacred Canon of Scripture. And the like sentence is pronounced upon them who add ought thereto, *v.* 18. which speaks sad things against Romanists, who have added all the Apocryphal Books: But it doth not say, that all who are not convinced of the Canonical Authority of every Book of Scripture, shall *de facto* be damned, if otherwise pious and penitent, and ready to acknowledge the Divine Authority thereof, were they satisfied in their Consciences thereannent. Do Romanists conclude their famous Cardinal *Cajetan* a damned Heretick, who questioned the Canonical Authority of sundry parts of Scripture?

To conclude this Section, *E. W. the Author of Protestancy without Principles*, that is *Edward Worsley*, an English Jesuit at *Antwerp*, *discourse* 3. *cap.* 4. *&c.* hath much spongious talk to confute the Protestants distinction of Fundamentals and Non Fundamentals, as unreasonable, and false. I should but beat the Air to examine all. Himself comprizes the substance of what he has said in this one argument; *Every revealed Article is asserted by an Infinite Verity; but an Infinite*

Verity

Verity delivers all it speaks with one and the same infinite certainty. Ergo, *all Articles of Faith have one and the same like infinite assurance, consequently, one is as ponderous as another, and equally Fundamental.* To this I briefly answer (forbearing to reflect again upon the formality of a Jesuits Syllogism) granting as uncontroverted the whole Syllogism, *viz.* that there is an equal objective certainty in all divinely revealed Articles, in a compounded sense, with divine Revelation, it being absolutely impossible that divine Revelation should be false; but withal peremptorily denying the Corollary which he infers from his Syllogism, *viz.* that therefore all Articles of Faith are equally ponderous and Fundamental, that is, (unless he intend to equivocate) that there is an equal necessity of the explicit belief of every one of them to the eternal salvation of souls. This consequent I deny, because though all revealed Articles be revealed by an infinite Verity, and with an infinite certainty, yet not with equal perspicuity, and so are not with equal facility penetrable by our weak understandings, nor is the explicit belief of all imposed under the same severe Sanctions, nor put under the same inseparable connexion with the salvation of souls. That it is so, may easily be evinced against any Romanist that will but hearken to his own reason: For it cannot be denied, that there be some Articles of Religion, without the explicite belief whereof, no adult rational person that hath the sense of reason (for I abstract from the cases of Infants, deaf, and mad-men) can be saved, as that there is a God, or immortal Soul, at least *Directo* and *Reflello* themselves will require the explicit belief of that Popish fundamental, of believing what the Church believes, which according to them, is also a revealed Verity. But it is as clear there be other revealed Articles, without the explicit belief whereof adult rational hearing persons may in some cases be saved: Yea Jesuit *Azorius Part. 1. Moral. lib. 8. cap. 6.* confesses a man may be saved without the explicit belief of the Trinity, and that he may have blasphemiously gross conceptions of God without Heresie, as that God hath corporeal dimensions like a man, that God the Father is greater in power, and more Ancient than God the Son: And he brings in *Panormitan*, and others of their great Doctors, affirming, that these gross conceptions of God may not only be without Heresie, but also without sin, providing their Darling Principle of believing what their Church believes be acquiesced unto: *Ergo*, the explicit belief of all revealed Verities is not imposed with the same severe Sanction, nor put under the same inseparable connexion with the

the eternal ſalvation of Souls, conſequently, all are not equally fundamental. I confeſs whatever diſparity be betwixt the material objects of Faith, as in themſelves conſidered, yet if a man know them to be revealed by God, he is bound to believe them all, with the moſt firm adheſion of mind, the meaneſt no leſs than the higheſt; and if in that caſe he ſhould misbelieve any of the leaſt of them, he would err fundamentally, becauſe he would explicitly deny the infinite Divine Verity. And this is all which Jeſuit *Worſleys* arguments do prove, which is not the thing controverted concerning Fundamentals. That which we affirm is, that ſome Truths are ſo propounded by the infinite Verity, that men are bound to believe them; yet if either through the weakneſs of their underſtandings, prejudices of education, or other ſuch like impediments, they do not diſcern them to be revealed, they may through mercy be ſaved, provided they have a ſincere willingneſs to believe every Article which they know to be revealed by the infinite Verity, and do unfeignedly repent, not only of their known ſins, but alſo *de occultis* of their ſecret and unknown errours: Excellently ſaid ſaid S. *Auſtin*, *Epiſt.* 162. *Qui ſententiam ſuam, quamvis falſam atque perverſam nulla pertinaci animoſitate defendunt, præſertim quam non audacia præſumptionis ſuæ perpetrarunt, ſed à ſeductis atque in errorem lapſis parentibus acceperunt, quærunt autem cauta ſolicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati quum invenerint, nequaquam ſunt hæretici deputandi.* I ſhall ſhut up all with the Royal teſtimony of our moſt Serene, Learned and pacifick King *James* 6. in his Anſwer to Cardinal *Perrons* Epiſtle, *That the number of things neceſſary to ſalvation is not very great, and that there was no more expedite way to peace, then diligently to ſeparate neceſſaries from not neceſſaries, and that it's the duty of all, who are ſtudious of peace, for leſſening of Controverſies which exerciſe Gods Church moſt diligently to explicate, urge, and teach this diſtinction.*

SECT. II.

Whether do the Scriptures contain clearly all the Fundamentals of Faith.

PRoteſtants maintain the affirmative, *The Pamphleter, pag. 99, and 100. with his Complices, deny that Scriptures contain all, ſo far as that they do it clearly:* So *Bell. lib. 4. de verb. Dei cap. 3, 4. Gordon of Huntly, controv. 1. de verb. Dei cap. 27. &c. Valentia lib. 5. de Analyſ.*

nalys. fidei cap. 5. Coster Enchirid. lib. 2. cap. 5. F. Valenburg. examin. princip. 3. Sect. 5. N. 6. &c. Yet when we say that Scripture contains all Fundamentals clearly, we mean not, that they are there in so many words, but that if they be not expressly set down in Scripture, they are at least by firm consequence deducible from it. If Scriptures do not contain all things necessary to salvation, and that clearly, then some instance of a necessary truth ought to be given, which is not clearly contained in Holy Writ, and Evidence ought to be brought of the necessity thereof to salvation? I appeal therefore all the Romanists in the world to give me one instance of this kind, *hic Rhodus, hic saltus.* The usual instances alledged by *Bell.* and other Romanists, have been examined and confuted often by *Whittaker, Chamier, D. Strange, &c.* I not *Scripture able to make us wise unto Salvation*, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. Were they not written for this end, *Joh.* 20. 3. *that we might believe, and believing have everlasting life?* How could this be, if they did not contain all that's necessary to salvation? Is there not an *Anathema* pronounced on him who teaches an Article of Faith, besides what is in the Scriptures, *Gal.* 1. 8. not καθ ὁ, but παρ ὁ? Did not *Tertullian* adore the plenitude of the Scriptures? Did he not thunder out a woe against *Hermogenes? Si non est scriptum, timeat vae illud adjicientibus aut ditrahentibus destinatum.* Did not the Apostles teach all necessary truths, and as S. *Irenaeus* witnesses, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 1. after they had preached it, they did commit it to writing; where also he calls the Scripture, *Fundamentum & columnam fidei*: And *lib.* 4. *cap.* 66. read (says he) the Prophets and Apostles, and ye shall find, *Universam actionem, omnem Doctrinam, & omnem Passionem Domini.* How peremptory is S. *Athanasius de Incarnatione Christi edit. Paris. Anno* 1627. *pag.* 621. *Quae est ista vestrae immodestiae vecordia, ἀπονοια τῆς ἀμετρίας ut loquamini quae scripta non sunt?* He holds it not only affrontedness, but madness to speak of Articles of Religion without Scripture. What think you of *Theophilus Alexandrinus* in 2 *Epist. Paschali in Bib. pat. Tom* 3. *Edit.* 3. *Paris.* 1610. *per Margarinum de la Bigne, Daemoniaci spiritus est extra Scripturarum Authoritatem, divinum aliquid putare.* And S. *Chrysost. in Serm. de Pseudo Prophetis, en calce Ephraemi Syri edit.* 3. *Colon* 1616. *Nihil utilum sacra Scriptura reticuit. Hierom. in Micah cap.* 1. *Ecclesia non est egressa de finibus suis; i. e. de Scripturis —— vos vero Haeretici, aedificastis domum in derisum non in Scripturis, sed in vicinia Scripturarum*; where the Scripture is held forth as the Boundary of the Church, beyond which she

ſhe may not paſs; and dogmatizing without Scripture, is given as a character of Hereticks: And on *Hag. cap.* 1. *verſ.* 11. he condemns unwritten Traditions, though pretended to be Apoſtolical: *Alia, quæ abſque Authoritate & teſtimoniis, ſcripturarum quaſi traditione Apoſtolicâ ſponte reperiunt atque confingunt, percutit gladius Dei.* How full is S. *Auſtin* to this purpoſe, *lib. de unit. Eccleſ. cap.* 3. *auferantur de medio quæ adverſus nos invicem, non ex divinis Canonicis libris, ſed aliunde recitamus.* Hence *lib.* 2. *de doctrina Chriſti cap.* 9. *in iis quæ aperte poſita ſunt in ſcripturis, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem moreſque vivendi.* S. *Chryſoſt. Hom.* 3. *in* 2 *Epiſt. ad Theſ. in divinis ſcripturis quæcunque neceſſaria ſunt, manifeſta ſunt.* Did I not confirm the ſame from teſtimonies of Learned Romaniſts, namely *Aquinas, Part.* 1. *Queſt.* 1. *Art.* 10. and *Sixtus Senenſis, lib.* 6. *Annot.* 152. in my fourth Paper againſt M. *Demſter, pag.* 46.

The two laſt teſtimonies of S. *Auſtin* and S. *Chryſoſt.* together with thoſe of *Aquinas* and *Senenſis* the Pamphleter, *pag.* 101. endeavours to elude by ſome ludibrious diſtinctions: *It is true*, ſaith he, *moſt Scriptures are clear to Eminent Doctors, not to all indifferently: And again, they are clear to ſuch as take the places of Scripture, commanding us to hear the Church, and hold faſt Traditions, as two main Fundamentals for clearing all the reſt, and to ſuch as level the line of Prophetical and Apoſtolical interpretation to the ſquare of Eccleſiaſtical ſenſe, but not to others.* And here again he would abuſe D. *Field, lib.* 4. *cap.* 14. *as if he did favour the Popiſh Doctrine of unwritten Fundamentals*, whereas the Doctor has nothing to that purpoſe: But he muſt not be ſuffered thus to ſneak away.

For firſt, the Authors cited by me, ſpeak not only of the perſpicuity of the Scripture, but alſo of the fulneſs thereof: S. *Chryſoſt.* is expreſs, that all things neceſſary are clear in Scripture: So alſo is S. *Auſtin* in *lib.* 2. *de doct. Chriſti cap.* 9. Though therefore it were granted, that they meant, as the Pamphleter falſly ſuggeſts, that the Scriptures were only clear to Eminent Doctors, yet it cannot be denied, but they affirmed that Scripture contained all neceſſary and Fundamental Truths. But ſecondly, it's a manifeſt falſhood that theſe Fathers did reſtrict the perſpicuity of Scripture to Eminent Doctors, yea *Chryſoſt. Hom.* 3. in 2. *Theſ. cap.* 3. expreſly ſpeaks to people as diſtinct from Teachers, and chides them as neglecting Reading when they want Teachers. So that either the Pamphleter never read that place of *Chryſoſt.* or bewrays too much diſingenuity. As for S. *Chryſoſtom's Hom.* 14. in *Joh.* objected by the Pamphleter, there he only

ſays, diligence muſt be uſed in ſearching of the Scriptures, but does not at all reſtrict that diligence in ſearching Scriptures to Doctors of the Church; yea, *Hom.* 10. in *Joh.* and *Conc.* 3. *de Lazaro*, he is much in preſſing the people to read the Scriptures: And in *Epiſt ad Coloſ. cap.* 3. *Hom.* he urgeth them to do it, *magno ſtudio & diligentia*: There is as little ground to ſay, that S. *Auſtin lib.* 2. *de doctrina Chriſti, cap.* 9. intended to reſtrict the perſpicuity of Scripture to Eminent Doctors. Surely in *lib.* 1. *contra Creſc. cap.* 33. (the Pamphleter being in haſte, cited the *Cap.* but not the Book) there is nothing againſt the fulneſs or perſpicuity of Scripture, only in an obſcure queſtion, when *nullum de Scripturis Canonicis profertur exemplum*, then *Auſtin* adviſes the Church to be conſulted with, which no man denieth: But in evidence that he derogateth nothing from the Scriptures, *cap.* 32. he ſaid, *Sequimur ſane nos hac in re Canonicarum certiſſimam authoritatem Scripturarum* And in *cap.* 33. *Sancta Scriptura fallere non poteſt, & Eccleſia ſine ulla ambiguitate Sancta Scriptura demonſtrat*; I am remitted by the Pamphleter to two teſtimonies from S. *Irenæus*, one from *lib.* 1. *cap.* 40. whereas I have told him before, there are but 35 *cap.* in all that Book: The other is from *lib.* 2. *cap.* 47. I have read that *Cap.* but find nothing to his purpoſe, nor does he alledge any words from him. Is not this a notable juggle on ſimple perſons, to cite Fathers at ſuch a rate? Yet thirdly, were that precarious diſtinction admitted, it would at leaſt follow, that the Faith of Eminent Doctors were to be reſolved on the Scriptures, for to them they are granted to be clear in all things neceſſary. Fourthly, do we ſay that the Scripture is indifferently clear to all, as the Pamphleter doth here inſinuate? To a Jeſuit faſcinated with prejudice, to an implicit Colliar, or Proſelyte, whoſe eyes Jeſuits have pulled out, or to them whoſe eyes the God of this World hath blinded, 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. verily not. Such perverting of the ſtate of the queſtion does bewray a deſperate cauſe. Fifthly, the Adverſary, fearing that his firſt diſtinction concerning Eminent Doctors ſhould not hold water, betakes himſelf to another of taking theſe Commands, of hearing the Church, and holding faſt Traditions, as two main Fundamentals. But *I* have ſhewed, *cap.* 2. that the command of hearing the Church is to be underſtood ſo long as ſhe adheres to her Commiſſion, which is contained in the Scripture: and *cap.* 3. that it is more than any Romaniſt can prove, that by Traditions in that Exhortation, hold faſt Traditions, are underſtood Præter-Scriptural Traditions; ſo that theſe Scriptures make nothing for unwritten Fundamentals.

This

This distinction of the Pamphleter, coincides, upon the matter, with that of Jesuit *Baylie in Catech.* 8, 9. that the Fathers affirmed Scripture to contain all things necessary, because they contain all implicitly; for when they direct us to believe the Catholick Church, they direct us to believe all the Traditions which the Church believes. To this ludicrous answer, *Rivet* excellently replys, that then the Fathers, by giving these Elogies to Scripture, had commended it no more, than if they had called a man Learned, who points out the way to the School, or said that such an one had milk to suckle an Infant, who only can shew where a Nurse is to be found, or that one has a well-covered Table, who can but declare who hath it, which were ludibrious. If it were so, why was the Holy Ghost at pains to write all these Books of holy Scripture? Then there needed no more Bible, but hear the Church, as indeed *Gordon* of *Huntly controv.* 1. *de verb. Dei cap.* 27. says, that all Articles of Faith are contained in that one Article of the Creed, *I believe the Catholick Church.* Why then should they not likewise be all contained in that great and uncontroverted Fundamental, *I believe the truth of all that God reveals?* and consequently a *Mahumetan* shall be as good a Catholick as any Jesuit. But sixthly, let me argue a little from these two Scriptures, *Hear the Church*, *and hold fast Traditions*; either these are clear in themselves, or not: if not, how can they clear all the rest? if they be, why is the like perspicuity denied to other Scriptures containing as necessary truths? Seventhly, What is that square of Ecclesiastick sense, whereto the Pamphleter would level all Scriptural interpretations? Is it Tradition? Though Protestants, with *Vincent Lirinensis*, do grant to Tradition its due place among the means of interpretation of Scripture, yet now I must enquire, what if a question arise about Tradition it self? Has not this Pamphleter told, *pag.* 75. that then all must be referred to the definition of the present Catholick Church, that is, to their infallible visible Judge; and so the result of all these Cob-web distinctions, is this, They can grant that Scripture is clear in Fundamentals, provided nothing be taken as the sense of Scripture, but what their Pope or Infallible Judge pleases: And consequently, when *Chrysost. Austin, &c.* say, that Scripture contains clearly all that is necessary, the meaning is, that Scripture contains not the Articles of Religion clearly, but points to one who can unfold them? Are not these goodly glosses which Jesuits put upon Fathers? Must the World be cheated with such ludicrous non-sense? as if the end of Scripture were to point out their infallible Judge,

and yet it cannot be known what is Scripture, or the true ſenſe thereof, but by the ſentences of that pretended infallible Judge. Are all things in Scripture clear, and yet nothing at all clear, but to receive its clearneſs from the Romiſh Judge, who is alledged to be pointed out in Scripture, and yet there is not one word of him in all Scripture. I pray in what Text of Scripture is the Pope of *Rome*, his Triple Crown, and Infallible Chair, together with the enthuſiaſtick ſquare of Eccleſiaſtick ſenſe, treaſured up in his breaſt. I ingenuouſly profeſs I cannot find the place, unleſs it be 2 *Theſ.* 2. 3, 4. or *Revel.* 17. 4, 5.

It's objected by the Pamphleter, *pag.* 99. *that the Fathers who writ Catalogues of Hereſies*, Ireneus, Tertull. Philaſtrius, Epiphanius, Auſtin, &c. *did not diſtinguiſh betwixt Fundamentals and integrals among Divine Truths, for they condemned many leſſer things as Hereſies, and conſequently as damnable errours. The* Arians *are condemned as Hereticks by* Epiphanius, Hæreſ. 75. *And* Auſtin Hæreſ. 33. (*he ſhould have ſaid* 53.) *for denying the Faſts commanded by the Church*: *The* Eunomians *by* Auſtin, Hæreſ. 54. *for teaching, that no ſin could hurt a man, if ſo be he had Faith*: *The deniers of Free-will by* Epiphanius, *Hæreſ.* 64. Vigilantius *by* Hierom, *for affirming that Relicks of Saints ought not to be reverenced*: Jovinian *by* Auſtin Hæreſ. 82. *for holding Wedlock equal in dignity to Virginity*: Pelagians *by* Auſtin lib. cont. Julian. cap. 2. *for teaching that the children of faithful Parents need not Baptiſm, as being born holy*; *and the* Arrians *by* Auſtin, lib. 1. cont. Maxim. cap. 2. *for not receiving Tradition*: *All which*, ſays the Pamphleter, *is the Doctrine of Proteſtants.*

Whatever ſhew this Objection may have with ignorant perſons, yet I muſt advertiſe them, it's but a *crambe recocta*: Theſe Hereſies have been often objected by calumniating Romaniſts, *Bellar. Breerly*, &c. and as often confuted by Learned Proteſtants, D. *Field*, D. *Morton*, *Gerard*, *Whittaker*, *Rivet*, &c. yea, and many more Hereſies have been retorted *cum fœnore*, out of the ſame Catalogues upon the Church of *Rome*.

Briefly therefore I anſwer two things; and firſt, that neither Papiſt nor Proteſtant can admit, that all the Errours mentioned in the Catalogues of *Epiphanius*, *Philaſtrius*, *Auſtin*, &c. are Fundamental. Are there not many condemned in them for Opinions in matters diſputable, undetermined, and of ſmall conſequence, and which reſpectively are acquitted in both ſides. Hence *Alphonſus à Caſtro lib.* 2. *de Hæreſ. tit. Adam & Eva Hæreſ.* 2. denies all the Errours charged upon

Origen

Origen in these Catalogues to be Heresies: And *Bellar.* himself, *de script. Eccles. pag.* 135. *Edit. Paris.* 1630. confesses, that many things are numbered by *Philastrius* as Heresies, which are not Heresies. D. *Taylor* in his Liberty of Prophecying, *Sect.* 2. §. 20. to acquit the Fathers for stigmatizing persons so liberally with Heresie, conceives that they used the word *Heresie* in a more gentle notion than now it is with us; and in divers Paragraphs he endeavours to prove, that all Errours mentioned in the Fathers Catalogues were not Fundamental; yea, he questions also, whether the Fathers had sufficient Evidence in the matter of Fact, to fix every one of these errours upon these persons. It will not be amiss here to remember, that D. *Hackwell* in his Apology, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 8 §. 1. records out of *Aventinus* his *Historia Boiorum, Anno* 745. that Pope *Zacharias*, and *Boniface* Bishop of *Mentz*, condemned one *Virgilius*, Bishop of *Saltburg*, as an Heretick; for holding that there were Antipodes; and perhaps were induced hereto by the Authority of *Austin, lib.* 16. *de civit. Dei cap.* 9. and of *Lactantius instit. lib.* 3. *cap.* 24. If he say that Learned Bishop was guilty of a Fundamental Errour, and damned eternally for holding there were Antipodes, he will expose himself to the ludibry of any ordinary Mathematician.

Besides, if all be Fundamental Errours which are recorded in the Catalogues of Heresies, I am sure Romanists do err Fundamentally: Were not the *Collyridians* condemned as Hereticks by *Epiphan. Heres.* 79. for worshipping the *Virgin Mary*? The *Carpocratians* by *Epiphanius Heres.* 27. and by S. *Austin Heres.* 7. for adoring the Images of Christ, and *Paul*, the *Angelici* by *Austin, Heres.* 39. by *Theod.* in *Epist. ad Coloss. cap.* 2. and by the Council of *Laodicea, Can.* 35. for worshipping of Angels: *Manichees* by *Austin Epist.* 74. for granting Marriage to their *Plebeians*, and persons of less perfection, and prohibiting it to those that were more perfect; and yet like Romish Monks and Priests, they could dally with Concubines. Hence *Austin lib.* 2. *de morib. Eccles. & Manich. cap.* 3. said of them, *Quod non Concubitum sed nuptias prohiberent.* Were not the same *Manichees* condemned by *Leo* the first, *Serm.* 4. *Quadrages.* for abstracting the Cup in the Sacrament; the *Basilidians* by *Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. cap.* 7. and the *Heleesaite* for teaching the lawfulness of equivocation, and dissembling Religion in time of persecution: Is not the Doctrine of Implicite Faith noted as a pernicious Heresie by the Author of the Sermon *contra diversas Heres. tom.* 2. *operum Athanasii*, and by *Eusebius lib.* 5. *Hist. cap.* 13. as one of the errours of *Appelles* the Heretick.

tick. What ſhould I reckon out *Pelagians*, *Donatiſts*, *Euſtathians*, *Marcits*, the *Nudi-pedales*, yea *Rivet Cathol. Orthod. Proem. de Hæreſ.* reckons forth a Catalogue of fifty Ancient Hereſies ingroſſed in the Romiſh Religion. When Romaniſts have conſidered the affinity of their Tenets with the errours of thoſe Hereticks, they may tell us whether they hold all for Fundamental Errours, which are reckoned forth in the Catalogues of Hereſies.

I anſwer ſecondly, that it's a notorious falſhood that the Proteſtant Churches do own all the particulars mentioned in the Pamphleters Objection, I might remit him to the Authors who have long ago confuted theſe old raucid Calumnies, yet a touch I give of them.

And firſt, we maintain not with *Eunomians*, *that if a man had Faith, and retained his Profeſſion, how impiouſly ſoever he lived, he might be ſaved.* D. *Field*, when he is repelling this calumny of Romaniſts, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 22. breaks forth in theſe words: *If* (ſaith he) *any of us ever wrote, ſpake, or thought any ſuch thing, let God forget ever to do good unto us, and let our prayers be rejected from his preſence; but if this be as vile a ſlander as ever Sataniſt deviſed, the Lord reward them that have been the Authors and deviſers of it.* Who would not have thought that this ſerious proteſtation would have ſtopped the mouths of Romaniſts for ever? Yet this impudent Calumniator has the confidence to come over with it again: If our Proteſtation be not ſufficient to clear us, yet, I hope, *Bellarmines* confeſſion may be heard. Now he declares, *lib.* 1. *de juſtif. cap.* 3. and *lib.* 3. *de juſtif. cap.* 6. that we acknowledge that true Faith cannot be without good works: I know that *Bell.* notwithſtanding all this, endeavours *lib.* 4. *de juſtif. cap.* 1. to fix the ſame Calumny on Proteſtants, as if they denied the neceſſity of good works, by miſconſtruing ſome words which dropt from *Luther*, *Calvin*, and ſome others: But theſe are not only fully vindicated by *Davenant de juſtitiâ habit. & actual. cap.* 30. but alſo the Cardinal palpably bewrays the violence he uſed to his own Conſcience in this Crimination; for in the beginning of that very Chapter, he confeſſes that *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Melanthon*, *Brentius*, and the *Auguſtan* Confeſſion, had aſſerted the neceſſity of good works. All who know our doctrine, know that we ſubſcribe to that of the Apoſtle, Heb. 12. 14. *Without holineſs none can ſee the Lord.*

As to that which is charged upon the *Arians concerning Faſts*, not to inſiſt that it is queſtioned by Learned Authors, particularly by *Da-*

pens

nam in his Commentaries upon S. *Auſtin's* book, *de Hæreſ. cap.* 53. whether there were ſufficient ground to charge all that is alledged by *Epiphanius*, and out of him by *Auſtin*, upon the *Ærians*; and the rather, ſeeing there is no mention of the *Ærians* as Hereticks, either in *Theodorets* four Books, *Hæret. Fab.* or in the Church Hiſtories of *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, or *Evagrius*, but only in *Epiphanius* (which might have been occaſioned by his freedom in teſtifying againſt ſome miſdemeanours of *Euſtathius*.) He might have known that D. *Morton's* Appeal, *lib.* 5. *cap.* 1. in confutation of this ſame Calumny in *Breerly's* mouth, had ſhewed from *Luther* and *Calvin*, that publick Faſts enjoyned by the Church, are not diſallowed by Proteſtants: The like might be ſhewed from the confeſſion of Proteſtant Churches, particularly by the *Helvetian art.* 24. the *Bohemian art.* 18. *Argentin cap.* 8. and that of *Wittenberg tit. de jejunio*, and *Caſſander Conſult art.* 15. reporteth this to be the judgment of Proteſtants in the *Saxonick* confeſſion; yet I muſt put him in mind, that their own Cardinal, Jeſuit *Tolet*, in *Luke* 5. *Annot.* 70. confeſſes, that the preſent ſet Faſts of their Church, ſuch as the *Vigils*, four *Embers*, and *Lent*-Faſt, were not inſtituted by Jeſus Chriſt.

The third Hereſie that he mentions, is *the denying of Free-will, which he ſaith is condemned by* Epiphanius, *Hæreſ.* 64. In that *Chap. Epiphanius* diſputes againſt *Origen*, to whom he aſcribes ſundry other groſs errours, all I find ſaid in reference to *Free-will* is, that *Adam* by his Fall loſt the Image of God, whereby if *Origen* had only meant, that he loſt the habits of grace and holineſs, wherewith in the ſtate of Innocency he was adorned, he had been guilty of no errour. This being a truth clear from Scriptures, and acknowledged by Learned Romaniſts, as well as by Fathers and Proteſtants, as is evident from the debates *de ſtatu primi hominis*. But if *Origen* meant by the Image of God, the Natural Faculties of the Rational Soul, ſure it was an errour, and diſallowed by Proteſtants, to ſay, that the Image of God was loſt; for ſalo man, in ſo far as he has a Rational Nature, is ſaid *Gen.* 9. 6. to bear the Image of God. The ſame diſtinction is given in behalf of *Origen* by *Alphonſus à Caſtro de Hæreſ. lib.* 2. *tit. Adam. Hæreſ.* 2. where alſo he ſuſpects that *Epiphanius* zeal did overreach in charging this errour upon *Origen*; I might far rather charge Jeſuits with Pelagianiſm in the matter of Free-will. But of this hereafter; only now, he who would be ſatisfied, may ſee *Janſenius* parallel betwixt Pelagians, and Moliniſts, or Jeſuits.

The fourth Hereſie he mentions, is *that of* Vigilantius *condemned by*

by Hierome, *for affirming that Relicks of Saints ought not to be reverenced*: Need I tell him, that *Erasmus* wished that *Hierome* had used more Reasoning, and less Railing in his debates with *Vigilantius*. Learned *Fulk* against the *Rhemists*, *art.* 19. 12. doubts whether *Hierome*, in that heat of dispute, might not represent *Vigilantius* Opinion more grosly than it was; and the rather, seeing by none of those who of old wrote the Catalogues of Hereticks, is he condemned for this thing, except only by *Hierom*: But if *Vigilantius* indeed asserted as *Hierom* saith, that the bodies of Saints should be thrown *ad sterquilinium*, to a dunghil, and trod upon, we do abominate such thoughts; the memory of Saints with us is precious: We judge a decent Christian Burial to be a honour due to their bodies; and therefore Romanists are highly injurious to them, who dig them up out of their Graves, and adore sometimes the Bones of a Robber, instead of a Saint; as testifieth *Cassander in Consult. art.* 21. *de veneratione Reliquiarum*; the true Veneration of the Relicks of Saints (saith the same *Cassander*) is to imitate the examples of Vertue and Piety recorded of them; all other ostentation of Relicks, for avoiding Superstition, he wishes to be abandoned: How far *Hierom*, and the Catholick Church, in his time, were from giving Religious Worship to the Relicks of Martyrs, *Hierom* himself testifies, *adversus Vigilant. Quis* (saith he) *O insanum caput aliquando Martyres adoravit, quis hominem putavit Deum.* Where *Hierom* rates it as such an impiety, as if one should Deifie a poor Creature.

The fifth Heresie objected to us, is *that of* Jovinian, *condemned by* Austin Hæres. 82. *for holding Wedlock equal in dignity to Virginity.* Seeing this Pamphleter is pleased to resume this long-ago confuted Calumny, together with the rest out of *Breerly*, should he not have considered how D. *Morton* in his Reply to *Breerly*, *lib.* 5. *cap.* 9. shews various cases wherein there is a mutual preference and equality betwixt Wedlock and Virginity. What impiety the Romish profession of Virginity without Chastity hath introduced into the Church, their own Authors have declared. So that *Nicolaus Clemanges* testifies their *Nunneries* are no better than *Stews*: I am sure, without Heresie it may be said, that Chaste Matrimony is better than impure Cælibat. If *Jovinian* intended no more, than that neither Wedlock nor Virginity are proper Vertues, surely if he in this were Heretical, *Gerson* was Heretical also, who both asserts and proves it by many arguments, much less can either Wedlock or Virginity merit Heaven, as *Soto* is brought in by *Gerard de Eccles. cap.* 11. Sect. 6.

Sect. 6. *Sect.* 218. impiously saying, *Quid Virginitas ſit ſatisfactio peccatorum maxima & meritum Regni Cœlorum.* Have not Popish Authors, particularly *Espencæus* noted, that *Hieron* was *parum æquus*, less favourable, than in reason he ought, to Chaste Matrimony? How grossly did Pope *Syricius* deprave that Scripture, *Rom.* 8 7. to disgrace lawful Marriage? If therefore *Jovinian* ran upon the other extreme, to affirm as *Bell. de monit Eccles. cap.* 9. *Sect.* 13. says of *Vigilantius*, *Ecclesiasticos debere esse uxoratos*, in that he was never allowed by the Reformed Churches; they are for a *licere*, not an *oportere*, for the lawfulness of Marriage, not for the necessity of it. Excellently said S. *Hierom*, *lib.* 1. *cont. Jovinianum*, where he is most in the praises of Virginity: *Circumcisio nihil est, præputium nihil est, sed observatio mandatorum Dei, nihil prodest absque operibus cælibatus & nuptiæ.* As Circumcision is nothing, and Uncircumcision is nothing without the keeping of the Commandments, so neither Virginity nor Wedlock do profit to salvation, without works of holiness. But as persons in a married estate are saved, if they continue in the Faith, so also it is by the same Faith, that they which live in a state of Virginity are to be saved. To this I only add that of *Nazianzen*, *Orat.* 11. *Cum in hac duo vitæ divisa sit in matrimonium & cælibatum, atque hic quidem sublimior & divinior sit, verum laboriosior & periculosior, illud humilius & tutius, neutrum horum Deo nos omnino astringit aut ab eo dirimit:* Where comparing these two Estates, he concludes *Cælibat* to be more sublime, but Matrimony more humble, and more safe, and that neither of them does either joyn us to God, or seclude from him.

The sixth objected Heresie is, *that with* Pelagians, *we say, the Children of Faithful Parents need not Baptism.* Had a Jesuit a Forehead capable of blushing, he would never have upbraided us with *Pelagianism*; for the World knows that they have indeed licked up the very Excrements of *Pelagius*, as *Jansenius* hath demonstrated in his *Augustinus*. But as to the Objection, we are so from denying the need of Baptism to Infants, that we say it's necessary, *necessitate præcepti*. Indeed we dare not be so cruel, as to condemn all Infants that die in the Womb, and were never in a capacity to be baptized: if we be stigmatized for Hereticks upon this account, then the Ancient Fathers, who by their long delay of Baptism shew themselves to be of the same Opinion, must also be Heretical. Doth not D. *Morton* Appeal, *lib.* 5. *cap.* 8. *Sect.* 2. cite a multitude of Romanists, as *Cajetan, Gerson, Catharine, Eighius, Tilmannus, &c.* as being of the

 same

ſame judgment with us, as to theſe things? Are all theſe Hereticks and Pelagians alſo? If it be ſaid that Pelagians deny the neceſſity of Baptiſm alſo, true; but on other accounts, then Proteſtants: Pelagians, as ſuppoſing Infants guilty of no ſin; Proteſtants, becauſe Pardoning Mercy is not chained up, and limited to means. As *Blaſtus* the Heretick obſerved *Eaſter* at the time of the Jews Paſſover, ſo did *Polycrates*, and the holy Martyrs of the Greek Church; but the different accounts on which they did it, made the one to be held an Heretick, and not the other: So that the ſame ſentiment, held upon different accounts, may be heretical in the one, and not in the other.

The ſeventh and laſt Hereſie, is *that with the Arrians condemned by* Auſtin, lib. 1. cont. Maxim cap. 2. *we do not receive Tradition.* O ſtupendious impudency! Did ever S. *Auſtin* condemn Arrians for not receiving Articles of Faith upon the ſole Warrant of unwritten Traditions? Doth he not expreſly *lib.* 3. *cont. Maxim. cap.* 14. appeal to the Scriptures for deciſion of Controverſies betwixt him and Arrians, *Nec ego Nicenum nec tu debes Ariminenſe tanquam præjudicaturus præferre Concilium, nec ego hujus auctoritate, nec tu illius deteneris. Scripturarum auctoritatibus non quorumcunque propriis ſed utriſque communibus, res cum re, cauſa cum cauſa, ratio cum ratione concertet.* Could not the Deity of Jeſus Chriſt, which was the Article for which Arrians were condemned, be proved by holy Scripture, that Fathers behoved to flee to unwritten Traditions: Are Romaniſts ſo miſcarried with their hatred againſt us, that they will ſhake the Foundations of Chriſtianity to reach us a blow? Doth not *Bell.* confeſs, *lib.* 4. *de verb. Dei cap.* 11. that the Divinity of Chriſt, which is oppoſite to the Arrian Hereſie, *habet expreſſa in Scripturis teſtimonia.* Shortly then, to rectifie the miſtake of this Pamphleter, the thing which *Auſtin* blamed in *Maximinus* the Arrian was, that Arrians would not admit the word ὁμοούσιον, becauſe it was not found in Scripture, and therefore *lib.* 3. *cont. Maxim.* he brings in *Maximinus* ſaying, *Hæ voces quæ extra Scripturam ſunt nullo caſu nobis ſuſcipiuntur*: This *Auſtin* ſolidly confutes, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 14. ſhewing, that the thing ſignified by the word was in Scripture, *Quid eſt homouſion, niſi minus ejuſdemque ſubſtantiæ, quid eſt homouſion niſi ego & Pater unum ſumus*; and then appeals to the Scripture for the deciſion of the whole Controverſie with the Arrians, *Nec ego Nicenum, &c.* Thus have I ſhewed that the Pamphleters Objection is falſe in all its grounds, as if either all the errours mentioned by Fathers were Hereſies

ſies againſt Fundamental truths, or that we owned all the errours enumerated in the Objection.

It's further objected, *pag.* 89. *that Scripture would make a man think, that one thing, or at moſt two, were neceſſary to ſalvation; as ſometimes the believing one point, ſometimes the doing of another. Heaven is promiſed to Prayer in one place, to Alms deeds in another; and* Mat. 19. *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments, teaches a Fundamental which Proteſtants ſay is impoſſible.* Is not this a daring impiety in a laſcivious Jeſuit, ſo to ſport with the Scriptures of the Living God, as if ſometimes they made one thing only neceſſary to ſalvation, ſometime another. For anſwer therefore; he would firſt remember, that our preſent queſtion is concerning the *Credenda*, things to be believed; but moſt of theſe inſtances are of the *Agenda*, things to be done by us: Whether this proceeded from his inadvertency, or were done purpoſely, to caſt a blind before an unwary Reader, is remitted to his ſecond thoughts. Secondly, it is a falſehood, that Scripture makes ſometimes only Prayer, at other times only Alms-deeds; at one time only Faith in the Son of God, at another time only the fear of the Lord, a Fundamental, as the Pamphleter inſinuates: For no where is the promiſe of Salvation reſtricted to any one of theſe, with excluſion of the reſt: When the promiſe is made ſometime to one grace, ſometime to another, it only imports the inſeparable connexion of all ſanctifying graces, that who ever has one, hath undoubtedly all. Thirdly, I grant, that in that word Mat. 19. *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments*, is contained a Fundamental of the Covenant of Works, but not of the Goſpel Covenant. This is evident from that deſcription of the two Covenants, *Rom.* 10. from *verſ.* 5. to 9. *Moſes* deſcribeth the righteouſneſs of the Law, *that the man who doth theſe things ſhall live by them; but the righteouſneſs of Faith ſpeaketh on this wiſe, If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy mouth the Lord Jeſus, and believe in thy heart that God hath raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved:* Where the perfect keeping of the Commandments is ſet forth to be the righteouſneſs of the Law, as the righteouſneſs of the Law is contradiſtinguiſhed from the righteouſneſs of Faith. Yet Chriſt does not mock the young man by that word, as the ſcoffing Jeſuit *Maldonat* on the place would infer from this Expoſition given by *Calvin*, for this righteouſneſs of the Law would really bring a man to eternal life, if a man truly had it: Neither is any mean ſo apt to convince a Juſticiary pretending to a legal righteouſneſs (ſuch an one was that young

man, as appears by his words, verſ. 20. *All theſe things have I kept from my youth*) as to charge him with the righteouſneſs of the Law. Chriſt therefore uſed a very proper mean for preparing that perſon to ſubmit to the righteouſneſs of God by Faith, *Phil.* 3. 9. had not his covetouſneſs choaked the work. In what ſenſe the perfect keeping of the Law is poſſible, or impoſſible, is elſewhere declared: now only I add, that neither under the Goſpel Covenant can Eternal Life be obtained, without a ſincere and ſerious endeavour to keep the Commands perfectly: But ſurely if the perfect keeping of the Commandments were a Fundamental of the Goſpel Covenant, our ranting Miſſionaries, and their diſſolute Proſelytes, might deſpair of ſalvation.

Pag. 87. and 88. it's enquired, *Whether every Fundamental can be ſo clearly proved by Scripture, that the words cannot be obviouſly and litterally taken in another ſenſe.*

Anſw. Every Fundamental may be ſo convincingly proved from Scripture, that no rational perſon can upon ſolid ground contradict the evidence thereof, elſe the Scripture ſhould not be able to make us wiſe unto ſalvation, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. I deny not but a wrangler may impoſe perverſe gloſſes upon the cleareſt words in Scripture, or out of Scripture, as that petulant Romaniſt *Reynaudus* gave a ſpecimen of his miſchievous Acumen, by impoſing blaſphemous gloſſes upon all the Articles of the Creed; but this only proceeds from ill diſpoſed minds, and neither impeaches the clearneſs of Scripture, as to Fundamentals: nor the certainty of our belief of them. But, ſays he, *pag.* 88. thoſe words, *This is my body*, ſignifie, and that moſt obviouſly and litterally, that Chriſts Body is really in the Sacrament: Like as when I ſay, *this is a piece of Gold*, *this is a piece of Silver*, theſe words litterally ſignifie real Gold and Silver. *Anſwer*, Thoſe words, *This is my body*, cannot ſignifie the Popiſh tranſubſtantiated Preſence of the Body of Chriſt without a manifeſt contradiction, as ſhall appear *cap.* 5. Theſe other Propoſitions, *this is a piece of Gold*, *this is a piece of Silver*, not being productive of the Silver and the Gold, as Romaniſts affirm theſe words, *this is my body*, to be productive of the Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament, are not parallel to the Propoſition under debate. But I will not here anticipate that which is to be handled at more length, *cap.* 5.

Pag. 103. he asks, *If it be a Fundamental to believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, which* (ſays he) *Auſtin believed upon Tradition.* *Anſw.* I grant it is a Fundamental, as a Fundamental is taken for the Rule of Faith, which makes us believe all the reſt: And ſo indeed

it

it is a principle having an intrinſick evidence of its Divine Original, as I endeavoured to ſhew in its proper place, yet I confeſs that our minds are prepared, by the motives of credibility, (whereof Tradition is one) to give a ſupernatual aſſent to the Scriptures as the Word of God; and this is all which *Auſtin* affirmed as to this thing, as hath been already cleared. Here it is to be noted, that though I call the Scripture a Fundamental, as being the Rule of Faith, yet I mean not, that the belief of this written Inſtrument is abſolutely neceſſary in all caſes to ſalvation; for who doth not know that of *Iren. lib. 3. cap. 4. Multæ gentes Barbarorum credunt in Chriſtum ſine chartâ aut atramento, i.e.* many Nations of the Barbarians believe on Chriſt without this writing of holy Scripture. Scripture is indeed the principal and ordinary Rule of Faith, yet it is not the only mean by which the Doctrines contained in Scripture receive Evidence; yea, the complex of the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity carry with themſelves an intrinſick Evidence of their own Divine Originals, as hath been alſo held forth in *cap.* 3. So that if they who are invincibly ignorant of the Scriptures, ſhould upon the Veracity of God, believe the Doctrines of Chriſtianity contained in Scripture and walk accordingly, they ſhould be ſaved even as we. But what (ſaith the Pamphleter) if one ſhould receive the New Teſtament, containing ſufficiently all Fundamentals, and reject the Old, with *Manichees*, admit of ſome Evangels, but not others with *Ebionits*? *Anſw.* He ſhould deny a Principle of Divinity; and therefore we ſhould diſpute againſt him, partly *ex conceſſis*, from thoſe Scriptures which he admits, and partly as with an Infidel from the common motives of credibility, which may contribute to the conviction of an Infidel, though they alone be not a ſufficient ground of divine Faith.

Pag. 104. he asks, *What if one ſhould deny the Word, the Name, and definition of a Sacrament, the keeping of Sunday, maintain Rebaptization, affirm one Perſon in the God-head, with* Sabellius, *or two in Chriſt, with* Neſtorius, *which are not in expreſs words in Scripture. Anſw.* 1. We muſt diſtinguiſh betwixt names and things; we ſay not, that names or words are Fundamentals of Religion, elſe the diverſity of Languages ſhould make diverſity of Religions. It's but a pieviſh humour to quarrel at words, when the things ſignified thereby are found in Scripture; it were enough to ſay to ſuch, as 1 *Cor.* 11. 16. If any will be contentious, we have no ſuch cuſtom, nor the Churches of God. *Anſw.* 2. Fundamentals may be contained clearly in Scripture, though not in expreſs words; and ſo the Pamphleter

either ignorantly or wilfully mistakes the very state of the question: I hope these truly Fundamental Articles of the Merits and Satisfaction of Jesus Christ, will not be denied to be contained clearly in Scripture, though those words be not at all there; and therefore I say, all those errors mentioned in the Objection, may be, upon the matter, confuted by Scripture, as I have shewed concerning some of them *cap.* 3. And the like might be done as to the rest, if I were not loth to blot Paper with impertinent Controversies.

Before I leave this question, I must yet take notice of three testimonies objected by the Pamphleter, *pag.* 103. from *Chrysost. Epiphan.* and *Austin*: For though they were long ago objected by *Bell. lib.* 4. *de verb. Dei cap.* 7. and have been fully vindicated by *Chamier, Whittaker, Davenant, Strange &c.* yet they are here propounded, as if nothing had been replyed to them: I begin with the last from Austin, *lib.* 5. *de bapt. contra Donat. cap.* 23. because in it the Pamphleter says, *that* Austin *affirms a Fundamental; namely, Infant baptism not to be contained in Scripture.* This citation demonstrates, that the Pamphleter has never read *Austin*; for in that *cap.* he has nothing of the Baptism of Infants, but only says, that the custom of not rebaptizing those who had been baptized by Hereticks, was received by Tradition: Neither is this a Fundamental, else S. *Cyprian* had erred Fundamentally, who still adhered to his Opinion of Rebaptization, though as *Austin* in that same *cap.* says, he were pressed, both with the custom of the Church, and Pope *Stephens* Authority, to the contrary: Nor could *Austin* mean, that the custom of the Church in this thing was not warranted by Scriptural Authority, for frequently he disputes that same point of Rebaptization against the Donatists from Scripture, as *lib.* 1. *cap.* 7. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 14. *lib.* 4. *cap.* 7. 23. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 4. *lib.* 6. *cap.* 1. *&c.* consequently *Austin* only meant, that there was no express prohibition of Rebaptization in *terminis*, or that there could no example from Scripture be produced of receiving one into the Church, who had been baptized by a Heretick, without Rebaptization: Both which we grant, and yet affirm with *Austin*, and the Catholick Church, that Scripture affords sufficient ground against Rebaptization.

His other testimony is from *Epiphan. Hæres.* 61. *we must use Traditions, for the Scriptures have not all.* To this it's answered, that *Epiph.* doth not there speak of Fundamentals. The point which he is asserting is, that it's a sin, after Vowed Virginity, to Marry, which is a truth; for either there is sin in vowing rashly, not considering what

what ſtrength there is to perform, or by breaking the Vow unneceſſarily, if there be ſtrength to abſtain. Yet *Epiphanius* in the ſame place affirms, that in the caſe of Vowed Virginity, it's better to Marry, than ſecretly to Fornicate, or as he expreſſes it, *occultis jaculis ſauciari*, the contrary whereof is aſſerted by *Bell. Coſter*, and other Romaniſts: However, I hope Romaniſts are not ſo large in their Fundamentals, as to make that one. But ſecondly, it's anſwered by D. *Strang*, *lib.* 2. *de ſcript. cap.* 21. *pag.* 546. that *Epiphanius* doth not there ſpeak of ſimply unwritten Traditions, for that unwritten aſſertion of the ſinfulneſs of Marriage, after a Vow of Virginity, he there confirms from that Scripture, 1 *Tim.* 5. 11. and therefore he muſt call it unwritten, only *κατα τι*, becauſe it's not ſet down expreſly, and in *terminis* in Scripture, albeit it may conſequentially be deduced from it. I add thirdly and laſtly, though Scripture contain all Fundamentals, yet there may be much uſe of Traditions, as a motive of credibility, to introduce Faith, or to clear the meaning of Scriptures, or about hiſtorical things, &c.

In this third place I take notice of that teſtimony of *Chryſoſt.* in 2 *Theſſ.* 2. where he ſays, *that the Apoſtles did not deliver all things by writing.* Is this the preſent queſtion, whether the Apoſtles did deliver all things in writing? No ſurely, but whether all Fundamentals, or all things neceſſary to ſalvation, be committed to writing. Now *Chryſoſt.* in the place cited has nothing to the contrary of that, nay *Hom.* 3. on that 2 *Epiſt.* to *Theſſ. cap.* 2. he expreſly affirms, that all things neceſſary are clearly revealed in Scripture, conſequently he cannot mean that there be ſome Fundamentals not contained in Scripture, unleſs he did contradict himſelf. This is enough to diſcover, that the teſtimony of *Chryſoſt.* does not militate againſt our preſent Aſſertion, whether *Chryſoſt.* mean by thoſe things which he ſays the Apoſtles wrote not, only Rituals, as *Chamier* conceives, *Panſtrat. Tom.* 1. *lib.* 9. *cap* 19. *Sect.* 31. or the particular examples of the pious lives of Apoſtolick perſons, which might be conveyed down to theſe times by Tradition, as *Rivet* ſuppoſes in *Cathol. Orthodox. tract.* 1. *queſt.* 9. or Traditive Expoſitions of difficult Scriptures, Orally delivered by the Apoſtles, as *Chillingworth* inſinuates in his defence of D. *Potter cap.* 3. *Sect.* 46. is not our concern at preſent to enquire. As Chriſt did many things which are not written, ſo is it probable that the Apoſtles taught the Churches many things Orally, and particularly did expound to them difficult places in their own writings. But as the memory of the unwritten works of our Savi-

our

our is quite loſt, ſo alſo have the Traditive Expoſitions of difficult Scriptures periſhed many Ages ago, inſomuch that the Ancient Fathers are broken into many different Opinions concerning obſcure Scriptures: By which it appears, that Records are a more faithful keeper than Reports. Had the knowledge of the unwritten works of our Saviour, or of the Traditive Expoſitions of Scriptures, given by the Apoſtles, been preſerved, they ought to have been firmly believed; but ſeeing God has permitted the memory of them to be loſt, he hath alſo freed us from the obligation of believing them. And ſo much of the ſecond queſtion; I now proceed to

SECT. III.

Whether all be Fundamentals which the Church impoſes as Fundamental.

I Anſwer negatively: But the Pamphleter, *pag.* 91, and 92. and and other Jeſuited Romaniſts affirm. Where it muſt be obſerved how groſly the Pamphleter does miſrepreſent the ſtate of the queſtion, *pag.* 90, 91. as if the queſtion betwixt us were, *Whether a man may either ſuſpend his aſſent, or poſitively diſſent from leſſer things, when they are revealed by God, and propounded to him by the ſame Authority, with the moſt neceſſary Articles of Faith.* And he charges Proteſtants as maintaining the affirmative part of the queſtion, as thus ſtated. But this is a notorious prevarication: For all Proteſtants do acknowledge, that we are bound to believe whatever God is pleaſed to reveal uuto us; yea, not to aſſent to the leaſt material object of Faith, when it is known that God has revealed it, were an impeaching of the Veracity of God, and ſo hainous a treſpaſs, that if continued in, ſhould aſſuredly damn eternally. Nay further, as acute M. *Chillingworth* obſerves, *Part.* 1. *cap.* 3. *Sect.* 15. He that believes, though erroniouſly, any thing to be revealed by God, and yet will contradict it, is hainouſly guilty of derogation from the Veracity of God. The moſt that Proteſtants affirm (to which all ſolid Chriſtians ever aſſented) is, that through the weakneſs of our underſtanding, we not being able to penetrate all truths divinely revealed, we may ſometimes ſuppoſe that not to be revealed by God, which is revealed by him, or that to be revealed by him, which is not revealed. In this caſe (which was *Cyprians* in the matter of Rebaptization) if a man believe firmly, not only the Veracity

racity of God, and be ready to aſſent to the particular truth whereof now he doubts, if he knew it were revealed by God, but alſo believes the moſt weighty Articles of the Chriſtian Faith; we ſay, in that caſe, our Lord doth graciouſly pardon the misbelief of ſmaller material objects of Faith, which through infirmity are misbelieved. This we have already confirmed by Scripture and Antiquity, *Sect.* 1. Laying aſide therefore his falſe ſtate of the queſtion, the true ſtate of the queſtion is, whether whatever the Church propoſes as an Article of Faith muſt be believed under pain of damnation, and conſequently is to be held as a Fundamental, ſo as without the belief thereof no ſalvation can be had; in this indeed we maintain the Negative, and my Adverſary, and Jeſuited Romaniſts, the Affirmative. That this is the true ſtate of the queſtion, may be evicted from the Pamphleter himſelf: For after his deceitful miſrepreſentations of the queſtion, at length he comes above board, *pag.* 92. thus: *The Church* (ſaith he) *in her publick Decrees of General Councils, ſtrikes with the Thunder-bolt of Gods Curſe and Excommunication, all ſuch as refuſe to believe any one point decided to be of Faith, which ſhe could not juſtly do, if every Article ſhe declares were not neceſſarily to be believed, when known to be decided by her*: It's therefore the decision by her that lays the neceſſity of believing upon ſouls. Yet it would be further noted, that by the Church, Romaniſts underſtand the Roman Church, or Church in Communion with the Pope, acknowledging his Headſhip and Univerſal Supremacy: And becauſe the diffuſive Body of the Roman Church cannot all aſſemble to define Controverſies of Religion, ther for it muſt be underſtood of her repreſentatives, & ſeeing Conciliary repreſentatives are very rare, and the ſenſe of their Canons are obnoxious to various debates; therefore this power of determining and impoſing Fundamentals, (though the Pamphleter in the words cited ſeem only to ſpeak of Councils) muſt at length be reſolved into the Pope. I wrong them not. Here Jeſuit *Greiſer*, ſpeaking in name of the reſt, in *defenſ. Bell. lib.* 3. *de verb. Dei cap.* 10. *Colum.* 1450. *When we affirm* (ſaith he) *the Church to be the Judge of all Controverſies of Faith, by the Church we underſtand the Biſhop of* Rome, *who for the time being governs the Ship of the Militant Church.* The queſtion is then, whether all that the Biſhop of *Rome* injoyns, *ex Cathedra*, and as matters of Faith, muſt be believed, becauſe he injoyns it, and that under pain of Everlaſting Damnation, the Jeſuited Party affirm, we deny: It's not the misbelieving what Scripture ſays, but what the Roman Church or Pope ſaith, that according to theſe men, does condemn Souls.

I shall not insist upon a large confutation of this absurd Doctrine, which cannot but ruine with its own weight, not being supported with any solid ground; only take these brief hints. 1. The Catholick Church, in all her Representatives, since the Apostolick Age, is fallible, as I demonstrated by many arguments *Cap.* 2. *Sect.* 2. and may injoyn Errours for Articles of Faith; *Ergo*, all that the Representatives of the Catholick Church injoyn as Articles of Faith, are not to be held as Fundamentals. This one argument is sufficient to overturn that Romish Structure. But 2. It's an intollerable Catachresis to affirm the Romish Church, much more the Pope, to be the Catholick Church, or to attribute the peculiar priviledges of the Catholick Church to the Roman, or to the Pope; by as good reason they might affirm *Italy*, or *Rome*, to be the whole World, and predicate that of *Rome* which is peculiar to the whole World, *Ergo*, though it were granted that the Catholick Church, or her Representatives, had power infallibly to determine Fundamentals of Faith, it does not follow, that this is the priviledge of the Roman Church, or Pope of *Rome*, as our Adversaries affirm. 3. Every thing that God himself reveals in Scripture is not a Fundamental of Faith, *Ergo*, far less every thing that the Church proposes: The sequel is evident; for if there be any reason why every thing proposed by the Church should be Fundamental, this must needs be it, because as Romanists affirm, what the Church says, God himself says: But this reason cannot be cogent, for beyond all peradventure, what is revealed in Scripture is revealed by God himself; and yet both Protestants and Papists acknowledge, that all revealed in Scripture is not Fundamental, therefore neither can all proposed by the Church be Fundamental. This argument concludes, that though she were infallible, as Scripture truly is, yet would it not follow, that all her definitions were Fundamentals of Faith. It may be here objected, that he who knows a truth to be contained in Scripture, and yet misbelieves it, erres Fundamentally; therefore also if the Church be infallible, he who misbelieves any point which he knows to be propounded by her, erreth likewise Fundamentally. Not to mention that this objection proceeds upon the supposition of the Infallibility of the Church, the falshood whereof, I hope, has already been evicted. I answer, that he indeed erreth Fundamentally, who misbelieves the least truth which he knows to be contained in Scripture, provided he know the Divine Original of that Scripture; yet not so much for misbelieving that particular truth (for in other circumstance

ces it may be misbelieved without a Fundamental errour) as for his explicite misbelief of the Veracity of God, which renders the man an Infidel. But, I hope, Romanists themselves will not say, that if Cardinal *Cajetan*, who questioned the Divine Authority of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, had thereupon misbelieved some particular Proposition which he acknowledged to be contained in that Epistle, had erred Fundamentally; and consequently, though the Church were infallible, as she is not, yet if he who questioned her Infallibility should also misbelieve what he knew to be propounded by her, he should not err Fundamentally: For in so doing, he would not explicitly question the Veracity of God, as in the first case. 4. If the Proposals of the Church made Articles Fundamental; *ergo*, after the Churches definition, the Christian Religion should be essentially different from what it was before, contrary to *Ephes.* 4. *there is but one Faith*: The sequel is evident, because after that definition of the Church, there should be Fundamentals or Essentials in Religion which were not before. And from this it follows, the now Roman Religion is essentially different from the old Christian Religion: For by the new definitions of their Church, they have made many Essentials which the Ancient Church never knew, as I demonstrated against M. *Demster*, *Paper* 4. 5. I argue with Learned M. *Stillingfleet* thus: The Church is a Church before the past out her definition, *ergo*, by her definition she makes no Fundamentals: The sequel is proved, because the Church cannot be a Church without the belief of all Fundamentals; *ergo*, whatever definition she passes posteriour to her being a Church, is none of the Fundamentals. *E. W.* the Author of *Protestancy without Principles*, *Discourse* 3. *cap.* 6. *Sect.* 19. superciliously undervalues this argument of D. *Stillingfleet*, supposing he hath evicted the nullity thereof by this simile: *As in a Kingdom or Commonwealth, after the settlement of some great matters* (I suppose he means the Fundamental Laws) *they may thereafter proceed to make new Laws; so he conceives it to be in the Church.* But the faculty of that Jesuit lies in throwing a Feather to the ground with high confidence. Two things (if I mistake not) may discover the lameness and impertinency of the Jesuits simile: And first it's beyond doubt, that after the settlement of the Fundamental Laws of a Kingdom, the King and Parliament have a Legislative Power to create new Laws, not only to declare what Laws formerly were in being, but to give a being to Laws which formerly had none. But the more Judicious Romanists deny, that

the Representatives of the Catholick Church, far less of the Roman, or a Pope, have power to make Articles of Faith which were not, but that their power is only declarative of Articles of Faith which formerly were. So *Alphonsus à Castro de hæres. lib.* 1. *cap.* 8. *Valentia* in *Part.* 3. *disp.* 1. *quæst.* 1. *punct.* 6. and *Azor. Part.* 2. *Moral. lib.* 5. *cap.* 3. *quæst.* 2. yea, so much is acknowledged by *E. W.* himself, *Sect.* 22. Hence when lately D. *Taylor* in his *Dissuasive, cap.* 1. *Sect.* 2. concluded the impiety of the Romish Religion, because it did attribute to the Romish Church, *i. e.* the Pope, power to make Articles of Faith, contrary both to Scripture, *Gal.* 1. 8. and to the third Oecumenick Council at *Ephesus*: It was replyed to him by a Romanist, that they only give to the Church a declarative power, to declare what be Articles of Faith. If the Church have only a declarative power, then she has not such power to make Articles of Faith, as the King and Parliament have to make Laws to the Kingdom: or if she have power to make Articles of Faith, then D. *Taylor*'s Charge of impiety stands in force against Romanists. They may chuse which of the two absurdities they will run upon. But secondly, if the King and Parliament should add to the Fundamental Laws of a Kingdom, when addition were made to them, thereafter the Constitution of the Kingdom should in so far be altered, and different from what it was, consequently if the Church should add to the Fundamentals of Faith, the Christian Religion should essentially vary from what it was before: Nay, if the Church may add to Fundamentals, and make that Fundamental which was not Fundamental, why might she not pair from them also, and make those things cease to be Fundamentals which were Fundamentals, and so overturn all Christianity, and make it a quite different thing from what it was. But the Unity of the Christian Religion, and of the Catholick Church, prove convincingly, that the Fundamentals of the Christian Religion are always the same, and unalterable. Sixthly and lastly, The absurdities of this Romish Doctrine may appear by the impious consequences which flow from it: As 1. The imperious Usurpation of one part of the Catholick Church, namely, of the Church of *Rome*, her Popes or Councils, over the whole Catholick, by this she assumes a mighty Soveraignty over the Consciences of all the World, to impose on them Fundamental Articles of Faith, which Christ never authorized her to do. 2. It establishes a most grievous Schism: thus she cuts off from the Catholick Church, as Hereticks or persons erring fundamentally, all who cannot submit to her heretical

retical Decrees. 3. It makes Romaniſts unchriſtianly uncharitable, and to conclude, that all ſhall be damned, which do not with *Iſaachar* couch down under the burdens which ſhe impoſeth. 4. Hence alſo it is that they abuſe the World with an implicite Faith, if they be in a readineſs to believe what is impoſed by their Church, it's enough, though they know little in particular what ſhe has impoſed; yea, ſome ſay, though explicitly they believe nothing. Nay *Tolet lib. 4. de inſtruct. Sacerd. cap. 3. If a Country man*, ſaith he, *believe his Biſhop propounding ſome Heretical Doctrine about the Articles of Faith, he meriteth by believing, though it be an errour; becauſe he is bound to believe, until it manifeſtly appear that it is againſt the Church.* O dreadful impiety! Shall it be not only not ſinful, but meritorious to believe Lyes, when it but ſeems to be the Doctrine of the Romiſh Church?

The abſurdity of the Romiſh Aſſertion being now ſufficiently evicted, our Doctrine, upon the other hand, may be clear; *viz.* that thoſe Articles are only to be held for Fundamentals, on which Scripture hath put a character of neceſſity: for the appointment of Fundamental Articles, or the preſcribing of the neceſſary conditions for obtaining Eternal Life, dependeth wholly upon the good pleaſure of God; and therefore are to be gathered from the Scripture, which are the compleat Rule of Faith, and deliver to us the whole Counſel of God, concerning our Salvation. But this Jeſuit muſt needs be ſtill prevaricating; and therefore *pag.* 86. he brings in this as a character given by me of a Fundamental, *if it be commanded to be believed by all.* But never did I aſſert any ſuch thing, nor did I ever think, that a meer neceſſity of Precept does infer a point to be Fundamental; we are commanded to believe Articles of Faith, whether integral or Fundamental: But in this is the difference, that Fundaméntals are alſo neceſſary, *neceſſitate medii & finis*, by neceſſity of the means, and of the end: ſo as Salvation cannot be attained without the belief thereof, neither is any thing to be held as ſuch, unleſs the Scripture, which is the adequate Rule of Faith, put a character of neceſſity thereupon.

From what has been ſaid I deduce this Corollary, that the unity of the Catholick Church ſtands in the unity of Fundamentals, and conſequently though there be diverſity of integrals betwixt Churches, yet if the Fundamentals be preſerved, they all make up one Catholick Church; the *Greek* Church, *Waldenſes*, *Wickleviſts*, and *Huſſites* may differ from us in integrals, yet if the Fundamentals

tals be held by all, we make up one Catholick Church. Hence also it may be judged, whether Romanists, or we be the true Catholick Church. We own all for Members of the Catholick Church, who own the Fundamentals, and superadd nothing destructive thereunto: But they exclude all who are not of the present Roman Faith, expressed in the *formula fidei* of *Pius* the Fourth, or in that English confession of Faith annexed to *H. T.* his Manual of Controversies, reprinted at *Doway* 1671, many copies whereof were lately apprehended at *Leith*, and consequently they rend themselves from the greater part of the Christian Church.

SECT. IV.

Whether was it necessary for the decision of the question betwixt Mr. Dempster, *and the Author, to determine the precise number of Fundamentals.*

ANswer negatively: for 1. the particular question betwixt him and me, when he turned to that usual to pick and subterfuge of Romanists concerning the precise number of Fundamentals, was whether the Scriptures do clearly contain all things necessary to Salvation. But this general, as I told in my sixth paper, *pag.* 92. may be proved without an induction and precise enumeration of all Fundamentals, and this I made out by clear Scriptures which he never once examined. But 2. take the controversie betwixt Mr. *Dempster* and me in the greatest latitude, It was concerning the religion of Protestants, and not of the particular sentiments of this or that Protestant Author, seeing therefore as I told in my tenth Paper *pag.* 219. that the Reformed Churches in their harmony of Confessions had not determined that precise Catalogue, should I have pitched upon it, I had left my work to follow a tergiversing Vagrant. 3. As it was not necessary, so neither was it expedient, that I being a private person, should take on me to define the precise Catalogue of Fundamentals, and the rather seeing the Romish Church extending the number of Fundamentals too farr hath Schismatically separated her self from the body of the Catholick Church, Nor do I know any thing more destructive to the publick peace of the Church, then the rash and unadvised determination of Fundamentals, for by that means who ever acknowledge not all these, are in the judgement of such persons excluded

cluded from the Catholick Church and Salvation, excellently ſaid, *Luther*, as cited by Mr. *Baxter Saints reſt*, *part.* 1. *pag.* 138. *Edit.* 4. *nihil peſtilentius in eccleſia doceri poteſt, quam ſicq que neceſſaria non ſunt, neceſſaria fiant, hac enim tirannide conſcientiæ illaqueantur & libertas fidei extinguitur.* 4. If a man believe all Fundamentals though he cannot preciſely diſtinguiſh them from integrals he may be ſaved. Can Romaniſts for all the noiſe they make about Fundamentals define the preciſe number of them, why then being ſo often required, particularly by learned *Chillingworth* and *Tillotſon* as 1 inſtanced *paper.* 7. *pag.* 122. have they never done it? yea Dr. *Holden in Anal. fid. lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. affirms it to be unreaſonable to demand it, and impoſſible to perform it, But 5. Its an impudent falſhood which this Pamphleter often repeats in his 5. Section, *that I had affirmed that the number of Fundamentals cannot be determined*, let him inſtance the place without varying my words, when I did affirm this, Nay I was ſo far from it that I challenged Mr. *Dempſter* of the ſame untruth *paper.* 7. *pag.* 122. But Jeſuits will not bluſh, though deprehended in ſuch Peccadillo's. All his pretext for this, is from a teſtimony of Mr. *Chillingworth part.* 1. *cap.* 3. *Sect.* 13. cited by me, wherein that Author affirms, *that more may be neceſſary to the Salvation of ſome then of others, and therefore to call for a preciſe Catalogue of points neceſſary to the Salvation of every one, were as if one ſhould call for a diall to ſerve all meridians, or for a coat to ſerve the Moon in all her changes.* Concerning which teſtimony I deſire theſe things to be noted. 1. This Pamphleter, as if he had been left to divine concerning the Author of that teſtimony, ſpeakes as one that gave a ſpecimen of his great reading, ſaying Mr, *Chillingworth*, *is the Man*, *as I conceive*, and yet I had in my tenth *paper pag.* 219. not only named *Chillingworth*, but pointed at *Cap* and *Sect* where this teſtimony was to be found. 2. This was Mr. *Chillingworths* aſſertion not mine, The moſt I ſaid of it, was *paper.* 6. *pag.* 92. What if it ſhould be added, that more is requiſite to the Salvation of one then another, whereupon a great Divine, whom I by name expreſſed *paper.* 10. *pag.* 219. ſpared not to ſay, *&c.* But I did not poſitivly own his aſſertion. Yet 3. it may ſafely be ſaid that more may be required to the Salvation of one then of another, and that its as impoſſible to determine a Catalogue of truths neceſſary to the Salvation of every one, as to find out a dial to ſerve all Meridians, or a coat to ſerve the Moon in all her changes, and yet not be impoſſible to de-

determine Fundamentals properly and ſtrictly ſo called. For clearing of this, it would be conſidered that there be two kinds of truths neceſſary to Salvation, ſome primarly, ſimply, and abſolutely, without the explicite belief whereof no adult perſon can be ſaved, and theſe are ſtrictly taken Fundamentals, others are onely neceſſary *ſecundum quid*, and Secundarily, as when a point of truth is diſcovered to be revealed by God, though in it ſelf it be not abſolutely neceſſary, yet in theſe circumſtances a man cannot diſbelieve it, or impugn it, and continue therein, without throwing himſelf upon damnation. For to oppugn known truth is a ſin, which without repentance neceſſarily infers damnation. On this account Mr. *Chillingworth* ſaid that the preciſe number of neceſſary truths could not be determined; becauſe one may ſee more of the material objects of Faith to be revealed than another, and ſo more may be neceſſary to the Salvation of one than of another, and conſequently its impoſſible that a certain number for all ſhould be determined, and ſo much alſo is acknowledged by Dr. *Vane*, *Loſt Sheep cap.* 8. *pag.* 88. Yet this concludes no impoſſibility of determining the number of the firſt kind of neceſſary truths, without the explicite belief whereof no adult perſon may be ſaved, though I neither judge it neceſſary nor expedient to be done by me at the preſent, perhaps alſo an Article of religion may be more clearly revealed then the Fundamentaly of it, for though it be abſolutly neceſſary to Salvation that Fundamentals be believed, yet its not abſolutely neceſſary, that every Fundamental be believed, under this reduplication, as a Fundamental: Among other reaſons, why it hath pleaſed the Lord not to reveal the Fundamentality of all Fundamentals as clearly, as the Articles themſelves, this may be one, leſt people reſting on the knowledg of Fundamentals, ſhould be leſs ſolicitous in ſearching after other divine truths, which though not of abſolute neceſſity, yet are very precious. It will be time to anſwer his ſquibs and raillery, from the changes of the Moon, when he has vindicated not only their own Miſſionaries who are known for moſt part to be a company of Apoſtate Runnagado's, but alſo the body of their religion and miſſal from multitarious changes, which ſome have not unfitly reſembled to a beggars coat patched up, at ſundry times of clouts of many colours.

But *how ſhall it be known* (ſaith the Pamphleter *pag* 85.) *that Proteſtants do agree in Fundamentals, if the preciſe number thereof cannot be known?* It might be reply ſufficient to appeal the adverſary

verſary to give one inſtance of a Fundamental wherein Proteſtants do not agree? Sure there is no Fundamental, which is not owned by ſome Society of Chriſtians, elſe there ſhould be no true Chriſtian Church in the World, but let the dogmaticalls of all the Chriſtian Churches in the world be ſearched, there ſhall not one be found about which Proteſtants are not agreed. but upon accurat triall, it may be made appear that its either falſe, or at leaſt not ſimply Neceſſary to Salvation. Conſequently it may be made evident that Proteſtants do agree in Fundamentals without determining the preciſe number of them. Nay the violent oppoſition made to the Reformed Churches by Papiſts and other adverſaries, are no ſmall confirmation that we hold all the Fundamentals, for ſurely if we did deny any Fundamental, our enemies, who wait for our halting, and love to grate upon our ſores, would have laid it forth convincingly before the World, which none of them having been able to do, it is more then probable that the Reformed Churches hold all the Fundamentals. But who ſaid that the number of abſolute Fundamentals cannot be pitched upon? Surely never I, learned Proteſtants ſuch as *Crakanthorp*, *Stillingfleet* and D *Taylor* ſpare not to ſay that they are contained in the Apoſtolick Creed, they judge it very probable that the ancient Church ſuppoſed the Fundamentals to be contained in their Creeds, *the Apoſtolick*, *Nicene*, *Athanaſian*, and that of *Conſtantinople*, If it be ſo, then ſurely Proteſtants agree in Fundamentals, for to all theſe Proteſtants do ſubſcribe and that in the very ſenſe, wherein the ancient, Church took them. But Romaniſts have added many Fundamentals not contained in theſe Creeds, and altogether unknown to the ancient Church, therefore they diſagree from the ancient Church in Fundamentals, yea and among themſelves alſo. Can they ſo much as agree, what is that Church into whoſe ſentence faith is to reſolved? I add further if there be ſolidity in that rule laid down by *Edward Fouler* in his deſign of Chriſtianity *Sect.* 3. *Cap.* 21. viz. *that he believed all Fundamentals, who upon accurat ſtearch can ſay that he is ſincerely willing to obey his Creator and Redeemer in all things commanded by him, that he entertains and harbours no luſt in his breaſt, that he heartily indeavours to have a right underſtanding of the Scriptures, to know what doctrins are delivered therein for bettering of his ſoul, and the direction of his life and actions.* I ſay, if this be a ſolid rule, then, certainly, we hold all fundamentals of religion, there being, thorow mercy, many thouſands of ſuch ſerious perſons in the Reformed Churches, who have ſuch a teſtimony in their conſciences. Yet, I deny not,

but this rule has need to be well cautioned, else I am afraid that *Arriani*, *Socinians*, and other blasphemous Heretick will be ready to conclude hereupon that they also maintain all Fundamentals, and therefore I speak of it only in conjunction with these things which went before. To shut up all in a word, let all the solid rules Imaginable be taken for trying, who have all the Fundamentals of Faith, and we decline to be tried by none of them. Whereas the Popish Church dare not adventure to be tryed but by that one rule, the falsehood whereof has in *Sect.* 3. been clearly proved, and is manifestly partial. *viz.* that all and only these things are to be held for Fundamental, which she defines to be such.

SECT. V.

Whether is the Popish Religion injurious to the Fundamentals of Christianity.

ANswer *Affirmatively*, and that many wayes, for. 1. If a Fundamental be taken for the rule of Faith, or the principal and adequate standard according to which all the material objects of Faith are to be measured, which is the Holy Scripture, as was proved *Cap.* 3. Then sure Romanists erre Fundamentally, for they have set up another Foundation and rule of Faith, *viz.* the sentence of their infallible visible Judge, or to speak in the language of most renowned Jesuits, the sentence of the Pope, hence *Bell. lib.* 4. *de Pontif. Cap.* 3. *Sect. Secundo Probatur*, Petrus, *& quilibet ejus successor est* Petra *& fundamentum ecclesiæ, i. e. Peter* and any succeeding Pope is the Rock and Foundation of the Church, and again, a little after *ejus prædicatio & confessio est radix mundi, si ille erraret totus mundus erraret*, and *Grexter defens. lib.* 1. *Cap.* 1. *de verb. Dei. pag.* 16. *pro verbo Dei veneramur & suscipimus, quod nobis pontifex ex Cathedra* Petri, *tanquam supremus Christianorum magister, omnium que controversiarum judex definiendo proponit i. e.* we worship as the word of God, what the Pope definitively propounds out of the Chair of *Peter* as the supreme master of all Christians, and Judge of all controversies. Though they verbally acknowledge the Apostolick Creed, which is supposed by many ancient and modern authors to comprize the Fundamentals of religion, yet they pervert the sense thereof, as particularly of that Article of the Catholick Church, as if there were held out the Catholicism, Infallibility, and supremacy

macy &c. of the Roman Church, none of which were ever believed by the ancient Church, ſo that to them may be applyed that of *Auſtin Tom. 3. lib. de fid & Symb. cap. 1. ſub. ipſis paucis in Symbolo conſtitutis plerumque Hæretici venena ſua occultare conati ſunt.* 3. Romaniſts have added many Fundamentals neither contained in Scripture, nor in the ancient Creeds, by which indirectly and conſequentially they overthrow the true Fundamentals of Religion; and the belief of theſe ſpurious Fundamentals are impoſed by them upon all, who would have communion with the Roman Church, whereby all that would not be involved in that atrocious treſpaſs of theirs, are conſtrained to ſeparate from them. Many of theſe ſuperinduced Fundamentals might be enumerated. Its indeed a fundamental, that Chriſt is the head of the Catholik Church, but who warranted to add the Pope as another head? Its a Fundamental, that Chriſt once offered himſelf a ſacrifice for ſin on the croſs, but who warranted them to add a daily unbloody expiatory ſacrifice in the *Maſs?* Its a Fundamental, that God is Religiouſly to be adored, but who warranted them to add that Images alſo are religiouſly to be adored? Its a Fundamental, that God is to be invocated, but who warranted them to invocate Angels or departed Saints? Its a Fundamental that there is an Hell and Heaven, but who warranted them to add a Purgatory for expiation of venial ſins, and the temporal puniſhment due to mortals ſins? Its a Fundamental, that God is pleaſed to reward good works with eternal life, but who warranted them to add that good works are meritorious of eternal life? Many more of this kind may be added by which conſequently they deſtroy the true Fundamentals. As for *Inſtance*, if there be a daily propiatory ſacrifice in the Maſs, if there be a Purgatory for expiating ſins of juſt men, if there be merit of good works then Chriſt has not fully ſatisfied for all the ſins of the elect, nor fully merited eternal life to us. Thus as Romaniſts do in directly overturn the ſoveraignity of princes by aſcribing to the Pope a dominion over them, *in ordine ad ſpiritualia*, ſo alſo they overturn indirectly the Fundamentals of Religion, by a ſuper-addition of new Fundamentals.

SECT. VI.

Were the Waldenſes, Wickleviſts and Huſſits of the ſame religion as to Fundamentals and Eſſentials with Proteſtants.

BEcauſe I maintained the *affirmative*, the Pamphleter *pag.* 94. 95. &c. *writs one invective againſt me.* But he might have known that this is no ſingular notion of mine, the ſame being aſſerted by the learned *Uſſer de ſucceſs. eccles. Cap.* 6. *Voet. deſper. cauſ. Pap. lib.* 3. *Sect.* 2. *Cap.* 9. *Morney myſter. iniqui. pag.* 730. *edit.* 2. *Flaccus Illirie. catal. teſt. Veritat. col.* 1498. &c. *edit Salmuriens. anno* 1608 Dr. *Francis Whyt in his reply to Jeſuit* Fiſher *pag.* 105. 130. 139. *Prideaux, prælect. de viſib. eccleſ. Sect.* 11. *printed. anno* 1624. *Hottinger hiſt. eccleſ. ſæculo.* 12, *Sect.* 5. *Cade. Juſtif. of Church of England lib.* 2. *Cap.* 1. *Sect.* 3. *Birbeck Proteſtants evidence Cent.* 12. *Paul Perrin* in his Hiſtory of the *Waldenſes*, *Samuel Morland* in his hiſtory of the evangelical Churches in the valleys of Piemont, and by many others which were here tedious to relate. The harmony as to ſubſtantials of Religion betwixt theſe witneſſes of truth, and the Proteſtant Churches, the author mentioned have copiouſly confirmed both by the confeſſions, and by the Apologies of the Waldenſes and Bohemians, and by the teſtimonies of learned Romaniſts, particularly of *Thuan*, *Guicciardin*, *Surius*, yea of *Cochlæus*, *Bel. Greiſer* &c. Hath not *Vorſtius loc. cit. Sect.* 4. ſhewed that the confeſſion of Faith ſet forth by the *Bohemians* and *Huſſits* was approved by *Luther*, *Melanchton*, *Bucer*, *Muſculus* and the Univerſity of *Wittenberg*, that *Wendelſtin* one of *Luthers* firſt adverſaries pronounced the Lutherans, *novos & Germanos Waldenſes* and that Jeſuit *Greiſer* called the *Waldenſes* And *Albigenſes. Calviniauorum atavos*, the Calviniſts Progenitors. Yea Pope Leo 10. in his letter to *Frederick Duke of Saxony* recorded by *Sleidan. Comment. lib.* 2. ſayes expreſly of *Luther*, *quod Wickleffi, Huſſi & Bohemorum hæreſes antea damnatas reſuſcitet.* That he revived the old condemned hereſies of *Wbickleff*, *Huſs* and of the *Bohemians*. Certain it is that the remains of the *Waldenſes in France* are incorporated to the proteſtant Churches. But why ſhould I reſume what the forcited Authors have ſo largely demonſtrated, *viz.* that *Lutherans* derived their doctrin from *Huſſits*, and *Huſſits*, from *Wickleviſts*, and *Wickleviſts* from *Waldenſes*? Mr. *Perrin* and *Morland* make

make mention of many of the ancient writings of the *Waldenſes*, which hold forth the conformity of their Doctrins with the Doctrins of Proteſtants, particularly one written *anno.* 1120. entituled, *What thing is Antichriſt*, another about the ſame time, entituled *The dream of Purgatory*, and a third as ancient as the other two entituled. *The cauſe of our ſeparation from the Church of Rome.* I ſhall only deſire thee Reader to ponder the Articles of doctrine which were charged on the Waldenſes, either as related by the *Magdeburgians cent.* 12. *Cap.* 8. *Col.* 1206. 1207. or by *Reginaldus in Calvino Turciſmo lib.* 2. *Cap.* 5. So virulent an adverſary that modeſt *Uſher* calls him *Turco-papiſta*, or as they are reherſed out of *Æneas Sylvius*, afterward Pope *Pius* 2. by Biſhop *Uſſer* and *Voetius*, and than Judge whether in ſubſtantialls they agree with Proteſtants. I exhibit only a few of them 1. That the Scripture is the compleat rule of Faith. 2. That the reading of the holy ſcriptures ought to be granted to all ranks of perſons. 3. That there is no purgatory, but that departed Souls go immediately either to Eternal torments, or Eternal joyes. 4. That its in vain to pray for the dead, that being but one artifice to ſatisfie the avarice of Prieſts. 5. That the Pope of *Rome* hath no ſupremacy over the Churches of Chriſt. 6. That Maſſes are impious, yea that its a fury to celebrate them for the dead. 7. That the Sacrament of the ſupper ought to be given in both kinds. 8. That its Idolatry to invocate, and religiouſly adore departed Saints. 9. That the Images of God and Saints ought to be deſtroyed. 10. That confirmation and extream unction are not to be held among the Sacraments of the Church 11. That auricular confeſſion is not neceſſary 12. That oyle ought not to be mingled with water in the adminiſtration of Baptiſm 13. That the conſecration of holy water and palm croſſes are ludibrous. 14. That its improfitable to implore the neceſſity and ſuffrages of departed Saints. 15. That ſaying of Canonick hours is but a trifling of time 16. That the order of begging Friers were invented by the devil. 17. That the Romiſh Synagogue is the whore of *Babylon*, theſe and diverſe other Articles of their doctrin are collected out of the forcited authors by *Uſſer Cap.* 6. *Sect.* 17. 18. Now whether they who believed the ancient Creeds and aſſented to the decrees of the firſt. 4. general Councils, and maintained

theſe

theſe particulars did not agree with Proteſtants in the ſubſtantials of Faith. Let thoſe judge who know the doctrine of Proteſtants.

But ſayes the Pamphleter *pag.* 94. *If I look upon them as being of the ſame religion as to ſubſtantials with us, then I ſhould juſtifie the erroneous and unchriſtian opinions which the Authentick records of thoſe times teſtifie they did maintain*, Anſwer, the contradictions of thoſe records to one another in the particulars charged on the *Waldenſes*, have given juſt occaſion to learned Proteſtants to convict thoſe records of falſhood and to vindicate the Innocency of the *Waldenſes*, ſee this prolixly done by *Uſher lib. de ſucc. cap.* 6. *from p.* 19. *to the end*, *Voet. diſp. cauſa papatus lib.* 3. *Sect.* 2. *cap.* 9. *as alſo Hottinger* and *Birbeck* in the places forcited, did I not in my tenth paper againſt Mr. *Dempſter pag.* 130. bring in *Paradins* in his Annals of *Burgundy*, and *Gerrard* in his french Hiſtory teſtifying that impious opinions were maliciouſly impoſed on them, *quod vitiis & corruptelis principum liberius reprehenderent*, ſhould I then juſtifie what themſelves did not juſtifie. Neither does my aſſertion oblige me to maintain any of their real errors, Is it any wonder that they living in ſo dark a time, did not diſcover ſo clearly as we, all the errors of Popery? Have I not often told there may be unity in fundamentals, where there are differences as to integrals?

But ſayes the Pamphleter, *I ſhould prove that thoſe Sects, were the Catholick Church ſpread through the whole World, and that their doctrine had ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles times.* It may be anſwer ſufficient to remember my adverſary, that Proteſtants never affirmed that they who went under the name of the *Waldenſes*, were the whole Catholick Church, yet ſeeing a teſtimony which I cited from Frier *Reyner* in confutation of that ſame objection, is ſo groſly repreſented by the Pamphleter, I muſt reſume it again, and a little more largely then before. *Reyner* therefore proteſtes *there was never a more dangerous Sect, then that of the Waldenſes, and that for three Cauſes.* 1. *quia diuturnior, becauſe its of longer continuance, ſome ſaying that it hath continued from the time of* Sylveſter, *others from the time of the Apoſtles.* 2. *quia generalior, its more univerſal, for there is hardly any country into which this Sect doth not ſpread.* 3. *becauſe*, other Sects are joyned with atrocious blaſphemies, *but this of Leoniſts or Waldenſes hath a great ſhew of piety, they live juſtly before men, they believe all things well concerning God, and all the articles of the Creed. Only the*

Roman

Roman Church they hate and blaſpheme, and the multitude are eaſily induced to believe them. This teſtimony to the Antiquity, univerſality and ſanctifie of the religion of the Waldenſes is given by a Romiſh inquiſitour.

Hereupon ſaith the Pamphleter *pag.* 94. *Mr. Menzies with his ordinary ingenuity, will have Fryer Reyner to ſay abſolutely the Waldenſes were from the Apoſtles dayes*, Reader, behold the ingenuity of a Jeſuit! When I read this bold accuſation, I thought perhaps my pen had given me the ſlip, for I do abhor it as diabolical and Jeſuitical to prevaricate purpoſely, but when I turned over to my ninth paper *pag.* 194. where the teſtimony is cited, I found the Jeſuit to be as voyd of ſhame, as of honeſty, for thus I cite that part of *Reyners* words, *yea ſome ſay* (ſaith Reyner) *from the Apoſtles dayes.* Is this to cite *Reyner*, as affirming abſolutely that the *Waldenſes* continued from the dayes of the Apoſtles, if this perſon dare ſo prevaricate in a matter of fact, where there be ſo many ſtanding witneſſes againſt him, as there be printed copies of my papers Againſt Mr. *Dempſter*, what Faith is to be given to his other criminations, let thoſe who have not forfeited their own honeſty, judge. But what advantage have Romaniſts by that, *ſome ſay of Reyners?* *O ſayes* the Pamphleter, *thoſe who ſaid, were Leoniſts, or Waldenſes themſelves as witneſſes Pilichdorphius*, this ſame evaſion was uſed long ago by Jeſuit *Greiſer*, and ſolidly anſwered by the learned *Uſher* de ſucceſs. *cap.* 8. *ſect.* 1. for Frier *Reyner* affirmes himſelf that the Sect of the *Waldenſes* was of longer continuance then any other ſect which could not be, unleſs it had continued from the days of the Apoſtles, Surely he could not think that it had its riſe from *Peter Waldus* anno 1160. For *Reyner* himſelf lived, as is teſtified by Jeſuit *Poſſevin in appar. Sacr. anno* 1254. ſo that there ſhould only have interveened, 94. years betwixt the riſe of this Sect and *Reyner*. But many ſects were of greater antiquity and duration then that, therefore that cannot be the Friers meaning, Mr. *Morland* in his forcited hiſt. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 3. proves that the inhabitants of the vallies of *Piemont* profeſſed the ſame doctrine ſundry ages before *Peter Waldus*, among the reſt he pitches upon *Claudius* Archbiſhop of *Turin* who about the year 820. ceaſed not to teach his people in this place, (as his adverſary *Jonas Aurelianenſis* confeſſes) that they ought not to run to *Rome* for the pardon of their ſins, nor have recourſe to Saints or their relicks, that the Church is not founded on Saint *Peter*, much leſs upon the Pope,

but

but upon the doctrine of the Apoſtles, and that they ought not to worſhip Images.

Pag. 95. The pamphleter is ſo civil as to ſay, *that I have a more juſt claim to* John Huſs *name, then to his religion.* I am not of ſuch anſerin ſtupidity, but that I could make as ignominious a reorſion upon my adverſary. But I chooſe to walk in the footſteps of holy Jeſus, who when he was reviled, reviled not again. Did not *John Huſs* before the Council of *Conſtance* maintain that there is one onehead of the Catholick Church, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt? Did he not ly oppugne the ſupremacy of the Pope of *Rome* over the Catholick Church? Did he not maintain that the Sacrament of the Supper ought to be celebrated under both kinds? Do not Proteſtants agree with *Huſſits* in many articles charged upon them, by *Æneas Sylvius in hiſt. Bohem. cap.* 35. how then ſayes the pamphleter, *I* may lay more claim to his name then to his Religion? May not Romaniſts be aſhamed to make mention of this Martyr *John Huſs*, whom their fathers at the council of *Conſtance* murdered perfidiouſly, contrary to the letters of ſafe conduct? am I not honoured with a peece of further conformity with *John Huſs* then in name onely, *viz.* to be an object of Romaniſts malice, and that it has not proceeded further, I owe to the mercy of God, not to their good will.

But ſayes he, *John Huſs was for invocation of ſaints, prayer for the dead ſeven Sacraments, tranſubſtantiation, yea and the Popes ſupremacy, and this he would* confirm, as from others, *ſo from hol, Mr.* John Fox, *who according to his uſual* modeſty *pag.* 69. He terms *a fiery proteſtant*, becauſe in his Acts and monuments he records the fiery and bloody perſecution of that ſcarlet coloured whore of *Rome*. The like he affirms *of Hierome of Prague*. But beſides that all theſe are fetched from *Breerlies Apology tract.* 2. *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 5. and that when I mentioned *John Huſs*, it was not ſo much his particular ſentments that I meant, as the doctrine of thoſe people, who were termed *Huſſits*, I ask the Pamphleter whether he gives moſt credit to the Counſell of *Conſtance*, and Pope *pius* the 2. or to Mr. *Fox*, *John Huſs*, and *Hierome of Prague*? now ſurely the Council of *Conſtance* chargeth *John Huſs* as maintaining that after the conſecration the bread remains. And whatever Apologies, he made for himſelf in this matter this is ſuſtained by the Council as an article of his enditement, ſo alſo Mr. *John Fox* in his Acts and Monuments *pag.* 1799. Edit. Lond. anno. 1632 teſtifies. *In*

he

he not accused as maintaining the errors of *Wickleff*. And is not this the fifth error condemned by the Council in *Wickleff sess.* 8. *substantia panis materialis, & vini materialis manet in Sacramento.* Is not this one of the Interrogatures prescribed by the Council at *Constance sess.* 45. as *Carranza* relates in *Summa Concil.* for discovery of *Wickleviists* and *Hussits utrum credat quod post consecrationem sacerdotis, in Sacramento altaris, sub velamento panis & vini, non sit panis materialis, & vinum materiale, sed idem per omnia Christus qui fuit in cruce passus?* Doth not *Æneas Sylvius*, or Pope *Pius* the 2d. charge the *Hussits* as affirming the equality of the Bishop of *Rome* with other Bishops, as disallowing prayers to, and invocation of Saints departed, as condemning the necessity of auricular confession, and excluding confirmation from the number of Sacraments? either then the Pamphleter must derogate Faith from his Pope and Council, or acknowledge that *Hussits* in these things do agree with us. Do Romanists hold that if a man believe, as the Church believes, he cannot be Heretick, though he err concerning weighty material Objects of Faith? have we not much more ground of Charity concerning Mr. *John Hus* and *Hierome* of *Prague*, who hold not only all the Articles of the Creed, but also acquiesce to the Scriptures as the rule of Faith, and were in a readiness to believe any point, when the consonancy thereof to the Scripture should be held out, as *John Hus* did often profess before the Council, and the rather he living in a time of much darkness? What ever were the mistakes of *John Hus* and *Hierome* of *Prague*, yet Mr. *Fox* avouches them to be Faithful Martyrs of Jesus Christ, which he could not have done, if he had not looked on them as agreeing with us in Fundamentals. *Its not enough with me or any Protestant*, as this Pamphleter slanders us, *pag.* 98. *that they oppose the Pope as Turks and Tartars do.* Indeed their Pope and Romish inquisitours have a greater kindness for Jewes and Infidels, and brothell whores, then for Protestants. They can indulge the one at *Rome*, but not the other. Are the *Waldenses*, *John Hus*, *Hierome of Prague*, who maintained the Apostolick Creed, held the scripture for the rule of Faith, and abjured many Papal errors and Superstitions, and had eminent testimonies of their Holiness from very enemies, to be laid in

the ballance with *Turkes* or *Tartars*? Protestants have need to look to themselves. It seems they may expect no more favour from Papists, if their Power were answereable to their desires, then *Turks* and *Tartars*.

SECT. VII.

Whether do the Greek Churches agree with Protestants as to Fundamentals.

THe *Pamphleter pag.* 98. denies. But takes no leasure to examine, what I said to the contrary, *Paper* 10. *pag.* 226, 227, 228, 229. Until that be answered I might supersede any further reply, yet now I add these two things. 1. That the Greek Church is vindicated from the *Heresie which this Pamphleter*, with others, *charges on them, of denying the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son*, by learned Romanists, particularly by *Lombard lib.* 1. *sent. dist.* 11. *lit. D.* Azorius *the Jesuit, par.* 1. *instit. Moral lib.* 8. *Cap.* 20. *q.* 10. and by *Thomas ab Jesu the* Carmelit. *de convers. gentium lib.* 6. *part.* 1. *Cap.* 8. As if the Grecians in that matter did differ from the *Western* Church, rather in the manner of expression, then on the matter. As for *the Pamphleters Inference thence, that the Grecians deny the distinction of the persons* its an inconsequential deduction, sayes *Bonæ Spei. tom.* 1. *Theol. Scholast. tract.* 2. *disp.* 4. *dub.* 4. *resol* 3. And generally the Scotists, but whatever the consequence be, the consequent is most falsely imputed to the Grecians, for they maintain no such thing. I add 2dly that the Greek Church do not only hold the ancient Creeds and Articles, agreed upon by the first four general Councils, but also do agree with Protestants in many of the points wherein we differ from Romanists, and therefore though they have their blemishes, I dare not say they err Fundamentally, and so exclude them from the Catholick Church. If we will judge of the Greek Church by the confession of *Cyril* their famous Patriarch and Martyr, which Reverend and worthy *Mr. Ieait* hath reprinted before his late book, what the consonancy betwixt the Greek and Protestant Churches is, may be apparent.

Ephraim

Ephraim Pagit, Christianor. part. 1. *Cap.* 4. reckons out, 19. points of agreement betwixt us and the Greek Church, wherein we differ from the Papists, They deny the Popes supremacy and infallibility, they hold the Scriptures as the compleat rule of Faith, deny Apocryphal books to be Canonick Scripture, celebrate the Sacrament of the Supper under both kinds, allow no private masse, no Image of God, they deny Purgatory fire, admit laicks to read the Scriptures, &c. this that Author proves by considerable testimonies, whereas the *Pamphleter* out of his *Manuel of controversies* tells us *that they say Masse, hold Transubstantiation, Seven Sacraments, pray to the Saints, and for the dead*, it may be enough to give him the succinct answer of the confutor of that Manual of Controversies, *John Tombs* in his *Romanism discussed art.* 2. *Sect.* 4. *viz.* 1. That the Greek Church hold not the Popish transubstantiation, whereby the Elements cease to be, but whereby they become what they were not, the transubstantiation they hold is a change of Communicants into the being of Christ, so as to be partaker of his divine nature, as the Apostle means when he sayes, *they are the Body of Christ*. These things are to be understood, *cum grano salis*, and in a mystical sense. But the Greek Church do not hold with Romanists that wicked Communicants, or Rats do eat the true and proper Body of Christ. 2*dly*. that the Greek Church hold no other sacrifice in the Masse, then as *S. Chrysostome* expressed on *Heb.* 10. a commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. Nor 3*dly*, do they pray to Saints as hearers of their prayers, far less as if they did help them by their merits, only they conceive that God hears prayers sent up to the Saints. Nor 4*thly*, do they pray for departed Saints, to obtain to them liberation from the pains of Purgatory. If we may credit *Roffens. cont. Luth. art.* 18. or *Alphonsus a Castro de hæres. lib.* 12. *tit. Purgatorium hæres.* 1. the Grecians acknowledge no Purgatory fire, only in their publick offices, they commemorate the dead, even the most Holy Martyrs and Confessors (whom all confess not to be in torments) and pray for their resurrection and solemn acquital at the last Judgment. Nor 5*thly*, do they with Romanists hold Seven Sacraments properly so called neither more nor fewer. How much of a Logomachy

is in that question I shew in my 10th. *Paper* against Mr. *Dempster pag.* 238, 239. Sure I am *Ephraim pagit. loc. tit.* recites the denying of Extream Unction, as one of the Articles of agreement betwixt the Greek Church and us, So that if the state of the questions were well cleared, and all circumstances duly pondered, the difference betwixt the Greek and Romish Church as to these things would appear. Who desiderate a more prolix vindication, I remit them to D. *Field his way to the Church lib.* 3. *Cap.* 1. and for clearing them at least from fundamental errors to D. *Stillingfleet* his vindication of the Arch-bishop against *T. C. Part.* 1. *Cap.* 1. who will seriously consider the servitude of the Greek Church under the *Ottoman* empire, and their want of means of Instruction which other Christians enjoy, together with the sedulity and subtilty of Romish Emissaries still traficking among them, may desist their admiration concerning the corruptions crept into that Church, and rather wonder that they have preserved so much of the doctrine of Faith entire. Learned *Vorstius in defens. Causa Pap. lib.* 3. *Sect.* 2. *Cap.* 8. observes that the more knowledge the Oriental Churches, and those in the Western part of *Europe* have of the estate of one another, the more the alienation of the Greek Church from the Roman, and their affection to Protestants doth appear, and particularly in that they do yearly excommunicate the Roman Church, but not the Protestant Churches, D. *Hornbeck in summa controv. lib.* 11. *de Græcis pag.* 977. regates passionately that there is no more correspondence betwixt Protestant Churches, and the Greek Church, by which these afflicted Christians might be strengthened under their tentations, and we better understand the state of the Oriental Churches. But this I hope at the time shall suffice for the agreement of our Church with the Grecian in substantials of Religion.

SECT.

SECT. VIII.

Whether the doctrine of Proteſtants in all points of Controverſie be openly againſt God and his written word (as the Pamphleter affirms) and ſo contrary to the Fundamentals of Religion.

THis *the Pamphleter boldly aſſerts and undertakes to prove* pag. 106. but his bold undertaking is ſeconded with weak and Childiſh performances. If Scripture be ſo clear to determine all points of controverſie betwixt us, to what purpoſe were all his Cavills Concerning an infallible viſible Judge, the corruption of originals, the unfaithfulneſs of tranſlations, the obſcurity and ambignity of the ſenſe of Scripture, the inſufficiency of means of interpretation &c. Is a Jeſuit ſo nimble that he can transform himſelf into all ſhapes, that he can fight againſt Scripture at his pleaſure? Is not this an uſual fate that attends error, to be inconſiſtent with it own ſelf. *Sortex ſuo Judicio.* In the general, I ſay, as to all the Scriptures he perverts, there is not one of them but Proteſtants have a thouſand times vindicated from the detorſion of Romaniſts. Many of them are moſt fooliſhly applyed, and queſtions betwixt Papiſts and us, are either perverſly or ignorantly miſrepreſented, I Nauſeat to examine ſuch childiſh ſtuff, yet leſt I ſhould only confute him with contempt, I overly touch particulars.

1. *Then he ſayes pag.* 106. *we proteſt againſt the goodneſs of God, in ſaying God created ſome for Hell, independently from their works, contrary to* 1 Tim. 2. 2 Pet. 3. If he mean that Proteſtants do ſay that God appointed to Damn any to Hell though they ſhould never be guilty of ſin, he calumniates us egregiouſly. Never Proteſtant taught that any ſhould be damned to Hell, but for ſin. Did not the Council of *Dort art.* 1. *can.* 7. make the object of predeſtination *hominem lapſum.*

sum. i. e. Man in his fallen estate? How then could he say that Protestants affirm that God creats men for Hell independently from sin? Did ever Protestants say more then that Scripture *Prov.* 16. 4. *God has Created the Wicked for the day of evil.* As for that text, 1 *Tim.* 2. knew he not that *Austin in Enchirid Cap.* 103. expounded it *de generibus singulorum* of men of all ranks, not of all individuals of mankind? And the other place 2 *Pet.* 3. 9. not willing that any should perish is restricted in the very Text, to the Elect, the τινας having a reference to the ἡμας, thus he is long suffering towards us, not willing that any, namely of us, the Elect, should perish. But do not Jesuits Pelagianize, while they make the decret of Election to be founded on the prescience of our good works, which Scripture makes a fruit of Electing love, *Ephes.* 1. 4. Do they not overthrow the omnipotency of God by attributing to him inefficacious wills? How is it that all are not saved, if he willed all to be saved? Does he not in Heaven and Earth whatever pleases him, *Psal* 135. 3.

2. *He sayes ibid, we protest against the mercy of God, saying Christ dyed not for all, contrary to* 1 Cor. 13. He should have said, 15. The Pamphleter might have known that Protestants do not exclude from the Reformed Churches, the learned *Camero, Amyrald, Capelus, Dallæus* who with many others, especially in the *French* Church assert universal redemption. But if it were fair to load an adversary with all the consequents which follow from his principles, though he do not see the connexion betwixt them, It might perhaps with more reason be said, that Jesuited Romanists do impeach both the Justice and mercy of God, affirming the most of them to be damned Eternally, for whom Christ dyed, contrary to luculent Scripture, *Rom* 8. 34. *who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that dyed.* Is it not the work of *Jansenius lib.* 3. *de gr. Chr. serv. cap.* 20. to evict the opinion of universal Redemption to be repugnant to the doctrine of the Ancient Church, particularly of St. *Augustin?* will it not be hard to reconcile the opinion of Universalists with that saying of S. *Austin. epist.* 102, *ad Evod. Non perit unus ex illis pro quibus Christus est mortuus.* i. e. Not one doth perish for whom Christ dyed. The Scripture cited by the Pamphleter is most impertinently alledged 1 *Cor.* 15. 22. *As in* Adam *all dyed, so in Christ shall all be made alive.* If the *all* there

there were universally to be understood for every one of mankind, it would follow that all mankind should have eternal Life, and be saved eternally, which none but an *Origenist* can affirm. Therefore that *all* is to be understood only of all them whom Christ the second *Adam* did represent *viz.* the elect, not of all mankind.

2. *pag.* 107. *he sayes we protest against the Justice of God, saying that God punishes us for what we cannot do, contrary to* Heb. 6. 10. *God is not unrighteous to forget their work.* A pertinent disputant indeed. That Scripture speaks of Gods rewarding good works, which Protestants deny not, but of Gods punishing the want of good works, which we could not do, it speakes not at all. A Sophister ought at least to have a shew of pertinency. As to the thing it self, never Protestant affirmed that God damned any for meer inability, but such is the pravity of our Nature, that with our inability to do good, oftentimes we joyn a voluntary neglect of good works *Joh.* 5. 40. *ye will not come to me that ye may have Life*, and for this it is, that the sinner is damned, ought he not to know what his adversary maintaines who undertakes so confidently to oppugne him?

4. *Ibid.* He sayes, *we protest against the wisdome of God, saying that God obliges us to things impossible, whereas* 1 Joh. 5. 3. *his commands are not heavy.* We do not say that God commands any things simply impossible. Any impossibility that is, we have contracted it sinfully in the loyns of our first Parents, and so God is not to be blamed for it. This accidental impossibility to keep the Law perfectly, Scripture frequently holds out *Rom.* 8. 3. *that which the Law could not doe, in that it was weak through the flesh* ver. 8. *they that are in the flesh cannot please God* Joh. 12. 39. *they could not believe* Matth. 7. 8. *a corrupt Tree cannot bring forth good fruit, see* Eccles. 20. this is an old Pelagian Heresie against which *Austin* and *Hierom* did dispute, as if the children of men were able to fulfil the Law of God perfectly, by ordinary measures of Grace given to them in time, revived by Papists and Quakers contrary to expres Scripture 1 Joh. 1. 8. 10. blowing up wretched sinners with vain fancy of a sinless state. as for that 1 Joh. 5. 3. *his commands are not grie-*

vous

vous, it must be understood in reference to the regenerate by the confession of their great *Douay* professor *Estius* on the place, for, saith he, to the unregenerate the commands of God are not only grievous, but also *quodammodo impossibilia*, in some kind impossible, But the regenerate are strengthened by Grace to yield sincere evangelical obedience to the Commands of God, yea and to delight in them *Rom.* 7. 22. *I delight in the Law of God after the inward man*, yet alas Jam. 3. 2 *in many things we offend all*, but these offences the Lord graciously pardons to penitent believers through the blood of Christ and so still to them his commandements are not grievous. *Dum quicquid non sit ign scitare.*

5. *Ibid.* He sayes, *we protest against Gods Veracity, saying that the Church can err, contrary to* Matth. 18. *and* 1 Timoth. 3. Nay in this they contradict the veracity of God, and not we, saith not the Apostle, Rom. 3. 4. *let God be true and every man a lyar*, and is not their Church made up of men, who can produce no more exemption from error then other Churches? As for these Scriptures alledged for the Churches infalibillity, they have been considered before. But the truth is, its not the infalibility of the Catholick Church, Romanists plead for, but of the Synagogue of *Rome*, and the head thereof the Pope, as if to question the infallibility of the Pope of *Rome*, and of a *Cabal* of his Trustees, were to question the veracity of the God of Heaven, and if they be found lyars, the most high God should be concluded a lyar. *Be astonished O heavens at so atrocious a blasphemy.*

6. *Ibid.* He saith, *we protest against the Providence of God, saying, that God has not given an infallible Judge. Whereas* Peter sayes, *no Scripture is of private interpretation.* Nay Sir, we do but protest against the pride and providence of your Pope, God having given the Scripture as an infallible rule, there is no necessity of an infallible Judge, because Scriptures are not of Private interpretation, therefore the glosses imposed either by Quaker, or Papal Enthusiasms ought to be exploded, as flowing from a private spirit. We are so far from allowing of private interpretations of Scripture that we desire all to be examined by the publick standard of truth.

7. *Ibid.* sayes he, *we protest against the efficacy of Christs death*

death, saying, that he hath freed us from the pain, but not from the guilt of sin. contrary to 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. O the impudency of a Jesuits forehead! let the World judge whether they, or we oppose the efficacy of Christs death, for 1. They say he died for many who are, or shall be damned, But himself will acknowledge, that we say, for whomsoever Christ died, they are, or shall be saved. 2. They say Christ hath not satisfied for all the sins of them that are saved, not for these they call venial, nor for the temporal punishment due to mortal sins, but we say Christ satisfied fully for all sins of the Elect. 3. They say *remissa culpa non remittitur pœna*, that the sin may be remitted and not the punishment, that a proper punishment to be undergone here, or in Purgatory, may be kept over the head of a Creature, after pardon. But we affirm, that when sin is forgiven, the punishment is discharged, what else is remission, but the dissolution of the obligation to undergo Punishment? May not all see the inconsistency of these Jesuit tenets with that Scripture 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. *The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin*; how then charges he us, as saying that Christs blood frees us from the pain, but not from the guilt of sin? Nay on the contrary, we affirm that the blood of Christ frees us both from the pain and the guilt of sin. We judge it impossible, that the one can be without the other, what is guilt but the obligation to punishment? Can a man be freed by a holy and Just God from punishment, and yet lie under the obligation to punishment? But I believe the thing which this *ignorant Pamphletter drives at, is that original corruption may be pardoned through the blood of Christ, and yet sinful concupiscence remain in believers*, and in this what do we say more then St. *Austin lib.* 1. *de nupt. & concupis. Cap.* 25. *Non ut non sit, sed ut non imputetur?* Doth not the Apostle who was in a justified estate bewail his indwelling concupiscence, *Rom.* 7. 24? Yet from it also the blood of Christ shall make us free, though here while we are *In agone*, it be left for exercise. Upon the hope of Victory is that doxology *Rom.* 7. 25. *thanks be to God through Jesus Christ.*

8. *Pag.* 108. He says *we protest against Gods order, tying sanctification to Faith only* (I believe he would have said *Justi-*

fication) *contrary to Jam.* 2. 24. Its not we but Romanists who oppose the order of God in the Justification of a sinner. Doth not the Apostle conclude, *Rom.* 3. 28. *That a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the Law.* Indeed that Faith though it be *sola* in the instrumentality of our justification, as some use the phrase, yet it is not *solitaria*, being joyned with other graces of the spirit and fruitful in good works. For a justified state and the soundness of Justifying Faith is demonstrated by good works, which is that which *James* affirms. I must use the Freedom to tell this Pamphleter, that Jesuits do not understand the nature of Justification, and therefore they still confound it with Sanctification.

9. *Ibid.* He sayes *we protest against the appointment of God, saying that good works done by grace do not merit, contrary to* Math. 10. *where its said that Christ shall render to every one according to his works.* It seems this man cites the Scripture by guess as well as the Fathers, for in all the tenth of *Matthew* that testimony is not to be found. There is indeed mention of the reward of a righteous man, but that reward and merit are reciprocal correlats, is more then all the Jesuits in *Europe* will prove. Doth not the Apostle *Rom.* 4. 4. *distinguish betwixt a reward of Grace and of debt?* Is not the reward of the righteous the free gift of God, χαρισμα, Rom. 6. 21. and therefore doth not presuppose merit, how piteously do our missionaries cheat their proselites in this matter: When we charge on them the proud and supercilious doctrine of merit, they ordinarly alledge it to be but a calumny of Protestants, yet here the denial of merits is charged on us as a fundamental error. Is not *Bell.* in the end constrained to take him to his *tutissimum*. Do we contradict the appointment of God, when we take the surest way? What more ordinary for Romanists on dying beds then to renounce their merits, I could give an instance of a near friend of mine, whose memory I honour, the most moral person I ever knew of that Religion, who about half an hour before his death, did solemnly renounce all his own merits and professed he had nothing to lean to, but the merits of Jesus Christ alone. It can be no good point of Religion that the best of them must renounce at death.

10. *Ibid.* Sayes he, *We protest against Gods divine authority*

in

in denying the real presence, contrary to the Scripture, saying, clearly, this is my Body. We deny not a real presence, but a corporal and *Capernaitical* presence under accidents of bread and wine, which Scripture no where asserts. As Scripture says *This is my Body*, so as expressly after consecration, its called *bread* 1 *Cor.* 11. and the heaven is said to contain his real *Body*, nay as we shall prove *cap.* 5. If these words were not taken in a Figurative sense, they should imply a manifest contradiction. Knows he not S. *Austins* rule, that when the proper sense of words does impart a flagitious crime, then the genuine sense of Scripture is figurative? now what a crime is this, that the living body of Christ should be devoured by men? nor can this be avoided, but by taking the words in a Figurative sense.

11. *Ibid. We protest*, saith he, *against Gods command, in forbiding Images as Idols, he having ordered two Cherubims to be set on the ark of the Covenant, Exod.* 25. O daring impudency! Is Image worship commanded by God? Sure then the 2*d.* command *Exod.* 20. 4, 5. must be none of Gods commands, as indeed Papists have razed it out of some of their Catechisms, yet we forbid not all Images, but Images of God and the Trinity, or Images of any thing for adoration. Produce, who can, institution or approbation for that in all Scripture. The Cherubims were indeed set above the ark, but no command for their adoration.

12. Sayes he, *We protest against Gods practice in denying honour to Saints, contrary to* 1 Sam. 2. 30. *them that honour me, I will honour.* Who does not see this whole discourse to be a Rapsody, either of calumnies, or impertinent allegations? Did ever Protestant deny honor to Saints? We only deny that they are religiously to be adored. Are honour and religious adoration terms reciprocal? The civil Magistrate and living Saints ought to be honoured: Yet I suppose this Pamphleter will not say they should be religiously adored. And *would be also infer from* 1 Sam. 2. 30. *that God adores Saints*, the Creator his own creatures? Might not such foolries have been rather expected from a child, then from one who would be reputed a *Rabbi*.

13. *Ibid.* he sayes, *we protest against Gods dispensation by denying the Power given to Apostles and their Successors to for-*

give us sins) *contrary to* Joh. 20. 23. *whose sins ye forgive they are forgiven.* We do not protest against Gods dispensation, we but protest against your imposing on consciences a necessity of auricular confession of all sins, how secret so ever, to your Priests, which God never enjoyned. We protest against your papal usurped power of indulgences, which neither the Apostles, nor the Pastors of the ancient Church ever assumed. We protest against an absolute authoritative power of forgiving sin by men, who cannot infallibly know who are truly penitent, and who not. We grant to Pastors of the Church a ministerial and conditional power of absolution. To them is committed the word of reconciliation 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. and no more is granted *Job.* 2. 23. The soveraign absolute power of forgiving sin is claimed by God, as his Perogative royal *Isai.* 43. 25. *Micah.* 7. 18. Nor can it be ascribed to any creature without blasphemy. For who can forgive sin but God *Luk.* 5. 21? yet a ministerial power of absolution is exercised by Pastours. 1. by the ministery of the word. 2. by the administration of the Sacraments. 3. by prayer. 4. by the relaxation of the censures of the Church, as is Judiciously expounded by the Reverend Bishop of *Armagh*, in his answer to the Irish Jesuits challenge, *cap.* 5. and the sober and Judicious among Romanists themselves are forced to acknowledg, that no more was given by Christ to the Apostles. So *Ferus* annot. in *Joh.* 20. and comment. on *Matth. cap.* 16. though sayes he, as he is cited by the said Bishop of *Armagh* it be the proper work of God to remit sins, yet are the Apostles said to remit also, not simply, but because they apply these means whereby God doth remit sins, which means are the word and Sacraments, to which we add the relaxations of the censures of the Church and prayer.

14. *Pag.* 109. He sayes, *we protest against the Satisfaction which Justice requires for our Sins, even after the guilt is forgiven, by denying Purgatory; contrary to* 1 Cor. 3. *himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.* O the seared Consciences of Jesuits who are not afraid to write at this rate! Know therefore that our protestation is against the injury, which Romanists do both to the Justice of God, and to the compleat satisfaction of Jesus Christ, by asserting Purgatory. If Christ have Satisfied justice fully, then Humane Satisfactions in Purgatory

gatory are forged in their mint house at *Rome*, If not borrowed from the old Platonists and Pythagorians. If Justice were compleatly satisfied by Christ, how can justice demand new satisfaction from the delinquent? If the guilt be forgiven, then all the obligation to pupilsiment is dissolved, so Justice can demand no further satisfactions. We deny not, but pardoned Saints, such as *David*, may be exercised with Paternal chastisements, that they may be the more sensible how bitter and evil a thing it is, that they have sinned against the Lord; but proper satisfaction to Justice by departed Saints in a place you call Purgatory, Scripture no where affirms. Your eyes must be anoynted with papal Chrism, that you see so clearly your Purgatory in that place 1 *Cor.* 3. I suppose *Augustine* was as clear sighted an interpreter as you, yet to him it seemed not so clear, yea he held it for one of these places in *Paul* which are hard to be understood, *lib. de fid. & oper. cap.* 15. and *quest.* 1. *ad Dulcit.* It seems Jesuit *Cotton* saw not such clearnes in it for Purgatory, when as *Thuan* records *lib.* 132. he would enquire at the devil what were the clearest Scripture for Purgatory: The Difficulty of this Scripture appears by the perplexed disputes both of ancient and modern interpreters concerning it, in so much that *Bellarmine lib.* 1. *de purg. cap.* 5. confesses it to be, *unum ex difficillimis totius Scripturæ*, one of the hardest places in all the Bible. Before he can make use of it for his Purgatory, he must fight not only with Protestants, but also with Fathers, yea and with others Popish authors. But it seems this Noble disputant, who snatches up any thing that came next to hand, hath never examined what is brought by learned Protestants, to enervate all inferences from it for the Popish Purgatory, as first, that the Apostle dosnot say, he shall be saved by fire, but as it were by fire; now though the particle *ὡς*, *as*, be not alwayes a Note of similitude, yet surely its most frequently so taken, and that is its most proper signification, who then can infer, that a real fire is here meant, 2. the gold, hay and stuble, of which the Apostle speakes in that context are metaphorical, must not then likewise the fire be metaphorical. 3*dly*, of the word *fire* be taken in that same sense *vers.* 15. in which its used *vers.* 13. when it is said that the *fire shall try every mans work*, (as it ought saith *Estius in* 1 *Cor.* 3. 13. Yea *Chemnit Paustrat. tom.* 3. *lib.* 26.

Cap. 14. *Sect.* 6. ſayes that this was never queſtioned before *Bellarmines*, time) then ſure this fire cannot be the Popiſh Purgatory fire for that fire *verſ.* 13. Is not Purgatory fire as *Bellarmine* himſelf proves by many arguments *cap.* 5. *Sect. alii intelligunt, the fire* verſ. 13. *tryes every mans work*, but Papiſts do not ſay that every mans work is tryed by Purgatory fire. And therefore *Bell.* to inforce this Scripture to ſpeak for Purgatory, kindles in it three fires, two in *verſ.* 13. and a third diſtinct from both in *verſ.* 15. Firſt a fire of conflagration of the world. 2*dly*. the fire of Gods ſevere judgment, and 3*dly*. their imaginary fire of Purgatory in *verſ.* 15. But this groundleſs fancy of *Bellarmines* triple fire is confuted to our hand by *Eſtbius. loc. cit.* though he ſuppreſs the Cardinals name. I appeal all *Bellarmines* favorites to produce me one teſtimony of a Father, or one ſolid reaſon for this triple fire in that Scripture. Leaving therefore for Brevity other arguments, and the different opinions of Fathers, and latter interpreters concerning that difficult place, albeit their expoſition, who by the day *verſ.* 13. underſtand a time in this Life, and by the fire, the word, and ſpirit, of the Lord, which are compared to fire *Jer.* 23. 29. *Matth.* 3. 11. by which all doctrines, yea and works alſo ſhall be examined, albeit I ſay this expoſition might be maintained againſt all the cavils of Romaniſts and is maintained by *Chamier lib.* 26. *cap.* 11, 12, 13, 14. yet I ſhall chooſe with learned *Dallæus lib.* 1. *de pœnis & ſatisfact. cap* 16. to come a little nearer to the Cardinal. I grant therefore, Not only that by the builders the Apoſtle underſtands the teachers of the Church, and by the *Hay* and *Stuble*, ſuperfluous and unedifying doctrine, But alſo that by the *day* may be underſtood the day of the great and general Judgement, which *Bellarmine* confirms by ſundry probable arguments, and ſayes that it was the ſenſe of all the Fathers, of many *I* confeſs, but I will not ſay all, and therefore *Eſtbius* ſhews more ingenuity with his *Fere*, almoſt, then the Cardinal with his *omnes*, all, Nay I further grant to him, that by the fire trying every mans work, may well be underſtood, the ſevere Judgement of God at the Great day. Hitherto *Bellarmine*, and I have gone along in expounding this Scripture, but now when it comes to the puſh, we di-

vide,

vide, at the laſt. For *Bellarmine*, that he may ſay ſomething for the Papal intereſt would have theſe words *verſ.* 15. he ſhall be ſaved *as by fire* underſtood, thus, he ſhall be ſaved having paſſed thorow the fire of Purgatory. But this is repugnant to *Bellarmines* former conceſſions, for this ſaving as by fire, falls out the day when the fire ſhall try every mans work, as is clear from the context, but that is by *Bellarmines* confeſſion, at the day of Judgement, conſequently this cannot be by the fire of Purgatory, for then the fire of Purgatory according to Romaniſts, will be extinct. I ſuppoſe therefore the learned *Dallæus* has hit upon the right ſenſe of the words, thus, he ſhall be ſaved, *yet with loſs*; he ſhall looſe the comfort of his work, and the additional reward of grace, which he might have expected, had he been more faithful. Nay it will be a miracle of mercy that himſelf is ſaved, he ſhall be ſaved with difficulty. So ſtrict and ſever will the Judgement be that he muſt undergoe, that he ſhall be according to the phraſe *Amos.* 4. 11. as a fire brand pluckt out of the burning, By this time I hope it will appear that Romaniſts travel in vain, when they would beat ſome ſparks out of this Scripture, to kindle their Imaginary fire of Purgatory.

15. *Ibid.* He ſayes, *We proteſt againſt the eternal Prieſt-hood of Jeſus Chriſt according to the order of* Melchiſedeck, *by rejecting the unbloody ſacrifice of the Maſs, contrary to* Mal. 1. 16. We moſt firmly believe Chriſts eternal Prieſt-hood according to the order of *Melchiſedeck*. But the abomination of an unbloody and propitiatory ſacrifice in the maſs; as derogatory and repugnant to the perfect ſacrifice offered on the croſs, we juſtly reject. Can there be a propitiatory ſacrifice without ſhedding of Blood *Heb.* 9. 22? Can there be a proper ſacrifice without the deſtruction

of

of the thing sacrificed? if the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross was perfect, why then must it be repeated? if it was especially in regard of the Mass-sacrifice that *Melchisedeck* did prefigure Christ, why did not the author to the Hebrews, who is so punctuall in enumerating the resemblances betwixt *Melchisedeck* and Christ, once mention that? yea doth he not purposely as seems exclude it, when he affirms, if he be often offered, then must he often suffer? Will the oblation of the Mass be eternal? Do not Popish authors acknowledge, that it will be interrupted, when their supposed Antichrist shall come? And will Christ then cease to be a Priest after the order of *Melchisedeck*? Can their authors agree upon a proper sacrificing act in the mass? what one sayes, does not another confute? ye may try, if ye can condescend to me on that sacrificing act, and the thing sacrificed, that can expiate the sins of living and dead. If you ponder these hints, I suppose you may find ground to look upon your Idol-sacrifice of the *Mass* as an abomination of desolation set up in the holy place. *But how then is Christ a Priest for ever after the order of* Melchisedeck, *if he but once offered himself?* I wonder that Jesuits who pretend to so much acuteness, do not advert that there are more Sacerdotal acts then the actual oblation of the sacrifice. Was not the high Priests intercession in the holy of holies a sacerdotal act? does not our Lord *Christ live for ever to make intercession* Heb. 7. 25? In the perennant virtue of that one bloody sacrifice once offered on the cross, *by which he has for ever perfected them that are sanctified* Heb. 10. 14. as for that place in *Mal.* 1. ye will say more then all the Jesuits that have gone before you, if you prove that it speaks of your sacrifice of the Mass; What is more usual for prophets of the Old Testament, then to

predict

predict New Teſtament duties under an alluſion to Old Teſtament rites? Have not our Divines brought very conſiderable arguments, to prove that *Malachy* does not ſpeak of any proper propitiatory ſacrifice, but of the ſpiritual ſacrifices of Prayer, Thankſgiving, and other holy actions, which *Rom.* 12. 1. are called a *living, holy, and acceptable ſacrifice to God.* Does not *Malachy* in that ſame verſe predict that *incenſe ſhall be offered up*, although your corrupt vulgar verſion hath omitted it: yet *Bell lib.* 1. *de miſſ. cap.* 10. acknowledges that it is ſo, both in the Hebrew, and in the tranſlation of the ſeverny. But the incenſe is without doubt to be underſtood Metaphorically, of the incenſe of Prayer, as *Pſal.* 141. 1. Why then ought not the ſacrifice alſo be taken in a ſpiritual ſenſe? Doth not the ſame prophet *Malachy* ſpeak of Levites alſo *cap.* 3. *verſ.* 3. *and he ſhall purifie the Sons of Levi.*—— that they may offer unto the Lord an offering of Righteouſneſs, and this alſo in reference to Goſpel times, as *Bellarmine* acknowledges *cap. cit.* yet I hope they will not ſay a proper Levitical Prieſthood is to be ſet up under the Goſpel, why then a proper ſacrifice? Hence *Mareſ.* againſt *Tirin controv.* 22. *N.* 5. ſays that not only the Chaldee Paraphraſts and other Jews, but alſo among Romaniſts, *Iſidor Clarius*, and *Vatablus* did expound the place of ſpiritual oblations ſo alſo did *Tertul. lib. contra. Iudæos*, as is acknowledged by *A lapide.* Nor are we againſt the accommodation which Fathers have made of it to the Euchariſt, as to a commemorative euchariſtick or ſignificative ſacrifice. As for the Cavils of *Bellarmine*, *Gordon of Huntly*, *Alapide* and other popiſh controverſiſts, to pervert this teſtimony of *Malachy* to a propitiatory ſacrifice of the Maſs, they are learnedly confuted by D. *Morton* in his treatiſe of the Sacrament *lib.* 6

Cap. 4. and *Maref.* in the place cited, not to mention others at the time.

16. *And lastly, Ibid,* He sayes, *We protest against all Gods commands, and word, by taking away free-will into: beying him.* Does their whole strength consist in lying representations? Let the world therefore know, we deny not free-will to man, we freely assent to *Austin. Epist.* 46. *ad Valentinum*, if there be not grace, how shall God save the world? if there be not free-will, how shall he judge it? and with *Bernard de gra. & lib. arb.* take away free will, there shall be nothing to be saved, Take away grace there shall not be a mean, whereby any can be saved. *I* freely grant that all the exhortations, promises, and threatnings of the word prove that God deals with men, as rational and free Agents. Only we protest against two sacrilegious crimes of Jesuited Papists in reference to this matter. 1. *That under a pretence of exalting mans free-will, they overturn the absolute Necessity of the free grace of God,* as if an unregenerate man could do things truely acceptable to God, contrary to loculent Scripture *Rom.* 8. 7. 8. *Joh.* 15. 3. *Matth.* 7. 12. *Heb.* 11. 6. Hence *Vincent. Lirinensis in commonit. cap.* 34. *quis ante profanum Pelagium*, who ever before that profane *Pelagius* did so presume upon the strength of free-will, as to Imagine that grace was not necessary to every good work. And Concil. *Auranf.* 2. *cap.* 7. If any say that by the strength of Nature, *bonum aliquod quod ad salutem vitæ eternæ pertinet*, yea *cogitare ut expedit, aut eligere*, too think or choose any thing as we ought——— *Hæretico fallitur spiritu.* 2. *We protest against them, for overthrowing the efficacy of the grace of God, to exalt the* Diana *of free Will*, as if both Elect and Reprobate had a sufficient grace. And

the

the reaſon why one is converted, not another were not the predetermining power and influence of grace, but becauſe the one by his free-will improves his ſufficient grace better then the other. Yea the Jeſuit *Molina* ſpares not to ſay, that the meaſure of Grace may be in him, who is not converted entitatively, more then in him who is converted, and yet through the mal-improvment of free-will may miſcarry, ſhould not this man make himſelf to differ from another, and have wherein to glory, contrary to the Apoſtle. 1. *Cor.* 4. 7. how then ſhould God be ſaid to work both to will and to do of his own good pleaſure, *Phil.* 2. 13? How ſhould theſe high epithets, and elogies be made of the efficacy of Gods working on believers *Epheſ.* 1. 19. *the exceeding greatneſs of his power toward them that believe.* What meant *Auſtin* when he ſaid that God wrought in us, *indeclinabiliter.* I know it would require ſomething of a Scholaſtick debate to clear the conſiſtency of free-will, with the efficacy of free-grace to which I will not at preſent digreſs. Only to cut off all the Cavils of litigious Jeſuits, I lay no more neceſſity upon the will of man, then do *Thomiſts* and *Dominicans*, if Jeſuits dare not pronounce them Hereticks, neither can they us, upon this account.

By this time I hope it may appear, that in all theſe particulars, the doctrine of Proteſtants is conform to the Scriptures, and the doctrine of Romaniſts repugnant thereunto. And ſo it hath befaln this Sophiſter, as did the army of *Eugenius* the Tyrant, the darts which they threw

against *Theodosius* and his imperial Army, were driven back by the wind into the faces of them that threw them.

I had almost forgot that the *Pamphleter, pag.* 104. *remits me to the touch-stone of the reformed Gospel, and to the Manuel of Controversies*, I believe indeed he is better versed in these trifling Pamphlets, then either in the Scriptures, or writings of Fathers. He will not offend, I hope, that I commend to his perusal the replyes made to these, particularly to Mr *Tombs* Romanism —— discussed against *H. Turbervile* his *Manual of Controversies*.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Concerning Transubstantiation, and the Number of Sacraments.

IN the seventh Paper against Mr. *Dempster*, pag. 126, &c. finding him to be of a tergiversing humour, so that albeit he was oft cavilling about the ambiguity of Scripture, yet would he neither argue against the perspicuity of Scripture, nor answer arguments brought for it. I could judge no means so probable to convince him of his Errour, as to pitch upon some Scriptures which Romanists say do most favour them, and to demonstrate that these are clear for us, I did begin with that, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, *This is my Body*, and offered to do the like, *p.* 129. with other controverted Scriptures, such as *Luke* 22. 32. *Mat.* 16, 18. 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *Job.* 21. 16. But though we exchanged divers papers thereafter, Mr. *Dempster* had never the confidence once to examin that argument against Transubstantiation, far less to fall upon other places. The Scribler, who now appears, supposes he hath solved that argument as easily as *Sampson* broke the withes wherewith *Delilah* had tied him, *Judg.* 16. 9. Yet I hope to make him sensible of his mistake.

SECT. I.

The Popish Figment of Transubstantiation briefly Confuted, and the Authors argument against it, vindicated from the exceptions of the Pamphleter.

PAssing by his undervaluing and approbrious words, I first take notice that *p.* 112. he says, *I bring only a Philosophical Argument*, *to prove that these words*, This is my Body, *are to be taken in a Figurative sense*: But if he be pleased to review what I said, he will find I brought an Argument from a Scripture-Medium, and confirmed the sence of Protestants with the testimony of *Austin contra Adimantum*, *cap.* 12. and

Tertull. contra Iud. cap. 40. None of which this vain-glorious disputant adventures to examine.

I was so far from looking upon that Argument which I brought as the only Supporter of our Doctrine, that I advertised Mr. *Dumpter*, *Pap.*7. *pag.*127. of armies of Arguments brought by *Whitaker*, *Chamier*, *Morton*, *Neibenus*, &c. to prove the same conclusion. Doth not the senses of all men in the world, find real bread after consecration? Did ever God deceive the senses of all men, through so many ages? If the Argument from senses were fallacious when the Organ and Medium are rightly disposed, and the object within convenient distance; how did Christ use it, *Luk.* 24. 38, 39. *Why do thoughts arise in your hearts, behold my hands and my feet, that it is I my self, handle me, and see, for a Spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.* Doth not consecrated Bread and Wine nourish Bodies as other Bread and Wine? Do they not putrifie and turn to worms when long kept? Have not persons been poysoned thereby? Will either meer accidents, or the true glorified body of Jesus do so? Was it ever heard that the blessing and consecration of a thing did destroy or annihilate it? What have Romanists here to consecrate but Bread and Wine? The glorified Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, I hope is above their consecration, and doth the benediction of the Bread make it cease to be? Doth not two things, *verbum*, and *elementum*, as *Austin* well observed *Tract.*80. in *Joh. A visible element and an audible word, concur to make up a Sacrament?* If the substance of Bread and Wine cease, where have they a remaining element which hath a Sacramental Analogy with the Body and Blood of Jesus? Will they say that a specter of meer accidents without a *subject* are an element with such an *Analogical* resemblance? Is not the end of a *Sacrament* to confirm us by things visible in the faith of invisible mysteries? Is not the figment of transubstantiation a thing so incredible to reason, that it tends rather to shake faith than to confirm it; is it credible if Christ had meant by these words that the Bread was Transubstantiated into his Body, that the Disciples who were scrupulous about far less matters, would not have moved one scruple concerning this stupendious mysterie? Are not figurative expressions very frequent in Sacramental purposes, as *Gen.* 17. 10. *Circumcision is my Covenant*, *Exod.*

Exod. 12. 11. *The Lamb is the Passover*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 3. the Rock is Christ? Doth not Romanists acknowledge multitude of figurative expressions in the justification of the Supper? As when the said, 1 *Cor.* 11. 24. *This is my Body which is broken*, was it then broken? Was there not there, *Enallage temporis*? So in Verse 25. *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*; are there not more figures than one? Is not the cup put for that which was contained in the cup? Can either the cup, or that which was in the cup be called the New Testament without a Trope? Why then judge they it so piacular a crime to expound these words in the same institution; This is my body figuratively? Is it not often called bread after the consecration, as 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. 1 *Cor.* 11. 26, 27. *Let a man Examine himself, and so let him Eat of this Bread?* Can they reconcile these expressions with their notion of Transubstantiation, without making all these figurative? Think they it not a Cyclopick-like practice to devour the living body of a Man; much more of their Saviour? Must not the Heavens receive Christ till he come again, *Act.* 3. 21. Are we not prohibited to believe these, who say, loe here is Christ, or there, or in secret Chambers, *Matth.* 24. 23. 25. Do not the principles of Romanists in this thing, expose them to perpetual hazard of Idolatry, not only through the uncertainty of the Priests intention, upon which, according to them, depends the consecration; but also through many other contingencies, such as the Priests erring in the pronunciation of the words, whereof the people can never have certainty, they being but secretly whispered, and though heard, doth every one understand Latin? Heard he never of the Priest, who having many Wafers to consecrate, said, *Hæc sunt corpora mea?* What should I blot Paper with the absurdities, which many have deduced from the replication of Christ's body in many thousand not contiguous places, the penetration of all the parts of the body of Jesus in every point, and the existence of accidents without a subject. Doth not *Renatus Des Cartes*, and many great Philosophers, question if there be such accidents in the world, as the Schools did commonly teach about the time of the Lateran Council? Is it not a goodly article of Faith, which is calculated to the variable and problematick Hypotheses of Philosophers, which

may have the vogue in one age, and may perhaps with more reason be exploded in another. Must Religion stand and fall with the Sect of Peripateticks? Is it not the height of Impudence to say that the words of the Institution are clear for their Transubstantiated presence, seeing *Scotus* their subtle Doctor confesses, that had not the Church interposed her definition, no man could have from them concluded Transubstantiation? It's not the perspicuity of Scripture according to *Scotus* that made the mystery of Transubstantiation clear, but the Lateran definition; and yet its questioned also, if in that Lateran Council it were defined. Are we the first who held the sence of these words figurative? Did not *Austin* positively say as much, *contra Adimant. cap.* 12. Is not *Theod.* very expres, *Dial.* 1. *Dominus imposuit signo nomen corporis.* And a little after, our Saviour, saith he, exchanged names, *corpori suo imposuit nomen signi, & signo imposuit nomen corporis sui, & ita qui se vitem ipse vocabit, vocabit signum sanguinem suum*; and again he honoured, saith he, visible Symbols with the Names of his body and blood, *Non naturam mutando, sed gratiam naturæ adjiciendo*, not by changing their Nature or substance, but by adding grace thereto. What need I more, may not their own Canon Law stop their mouths, *dist. 2. de consecrat. Can. hoc est*, and the gloss thereupon, where it is expresly declared, that the Sacrament is called the Body of Christ, *non proprie & in rei veritate*, not properly, *sed significante mysterio*, but by a mystical signification, because the Sacramental bread doth truly represent the body of Christ. Yea, have not *Spalat. lib.* 5. *cap.* 6. *Forbes. Instruct. Hist. Theolog. lib.* 11. *cap.* 9, 10, 11. &c. And *Monlin de Novitate Papismi*, demonstrated, that the current of Antiquity is for us in this matter, what a world of interminable debates hath this figment of Transubstantiation raised among their own men: So that hither may the lines be applyed,

Corpore de Christi lis est, de sanguine lis est,
Deq; modo lis est, non habitura modum.

But leaving these and such like grounds of Arguments, against this bloody Doctrine of Transubstantiation, for which Papists have shed the blood of many thousands of Protestants. I come to examine the Argument which this Pamphleter so much undervalues.

And

And firſt, I muſt remember him of one branch of the Argument which he hath not touched, which he will find in *pag.* 129. what Chriſt took in his hands, what he did break and bleſs, that he gave to his Diſciples, and affirm'd to be his body; but it was bread which he took into his hands, which he did break and bleſs; *Ergo*, It was bread which he gave and affirmed to be his body: Now all know, and *Bell.* doth acknowledge it, that the body of Chriſt cannot be predicated of bread. Conſequently the propoſition muſt be figurative; both the premiſes are clear in the Series of the context; ought not this Jeſuit either to have been more ſparing in boaſting, or elſe more through in examining the Argument?

Next I come to try how ſolidly he hath behaved himſelf in what he hath touched. I aſſerted indeed *pap.* 7. *p.* 127. *that theſe words of Chriſt, This is my body*, according to the Romiſh gloſs, would be inexplicable, falſe, and imply a contradiction, and conſequently their gloſs could not be genuine: I am ſo far from being removed from my judgment, by reading this Pamphlet, that the ſhallowneſs of his Anſwers do the more confirm me. And firſt I ſaid it was inexplicable, and therefore deſired *Mr. Demſter* to let me know what Chriſt meant by *hoc, this*; for if he meant either the bread or the accidents of bread, the ſence muſt be figurative; for theſe are not in a proper ſence the body of Chriſt. And by *hoc, this*, Chriſt could not mean his own *body*, it not being yet preſent when *hoc this*, was pronounced; Nor could he mean, *Ens in confuſo, individuum vagum*, or *contentum ſub ſpeciebus*; that is, ſomething under the accidents of bread, Chriſt himſelf knew not what, which are the deſperate ſhifts of Schoolmen. This I ſay, cannot be the meaning, unleſs they come to that height of Blaſphemy, to affirm that Chriſt's underſtanding was clouded with confuſions, ſo that he knew not himſelf what he meant by *hoc, this*; To all this he anſwers, *pag.* 112, 113. *That* hoc, this, *ſignifyed nothing determinately until the laſt word, or predicate* [my Body] *was pronounced.* A noble Solution forſooth, and worthy of the acumen of a Jeſuit! Doth he not by ſaying that when Chriſt pronounced this, it ſignifyed nothing at all determinately, confirm what I ſay, that their gloſs renders the propoſition of Chriſt inexplicable; for I can put no other

gloſs

gloss upon the words of this Pamphleter, but that neither the Apostles, nor yet Christ himself understood what *hoc* signified, when it was first uttered; it signifyed nothing determinately, then it would appear it signifyed something, but indeterminately, what can this be, but the *individuum vagum*, that others talk of; that is, in plain Scots, something, but Christ himself knew not what. Was the mind of our Saviour, in whom are all treasures of wisdom and knowledge, so clouded? Though it were granted, that the hearer could not understand so distinctly, what were meant by *hoc*, *this*, until the predicate & whole proposition were uttered, yet sure at the 1st utering of the subject *hoc*, the speaker himself knows as perfectly what he means by it, as when the whole *proposition* is uttered. Now the question betwixt *Romanists* and us, is, what Christ who was the speaker, understood by *this*, when he uttered it; Sure it could be nothing, but that which he had in his hand, at the present, but at the present he had nothing in his hand but real bread, for the body of Christ was not substituted in the place of bread, according to the principles of Transubstantiators, *ergo*, *hoc*, *this*, could signifie nothing but bread, and that determinately, and consequently the proposition must be figurative. Suppose a man holding out a piece of Gold to another, should say, this is a *Jacobus*, who could deny, but by *this* at the first pronunciation thereof, he did understand the piece of Gold? whether he or I do *quibble* concerning this matter, others may judge.

I added Secondly, *pag.* 128. that according to the Popish gloss, this proposition of Christ's were both false, and should imply a manifest contradiction. This I confirmed two wayes; First, because a true affirmative proposition *de præsenti* cannot produce its own object, else in that instant of Nature, wherein the proposition is conceived before its object, as the cause before its effect; the proposition should be true, as is supposed, and not true, because the object in that instant is not. Secondly, because at least in that instant of time, wherein the copula of an affirmative proposition *de præsenti* is enunciated, the object ought to exist. But according to Transubstantiators in that instant of time wherein Christ pronounced the copula of this proposition, *This is my body*, Christ's body was not in the Sacrament, and there-

therefore the propoſition in the ſenſe of Tranſubſtantiators muſt be falſe. This Argument he firſt retorts, *pag.* 113. *Alleadging that this other affirmative propoſition of Chriſt* de præſenti, *Joh.* 15. *This is my command, that ye love one another, doth produce its own object*; and pag. 115. he adds many more, *viz. let the light be made, let the firmament be made, young man I ſay unto thee, ariſe, I will, be thou healed.* I wonder that with theſe words of God, *fiat cælum*, he did not joyn theſe of the Pope, *Esto Cardinalis*, whereby his Holineſs, like another Deity, by two words, of a kind of *non ens*, creates a Cardinal. Yet I muſt take leave to tell him, that in none of theſe examples, is there an inſtance of an affirmative propoſition *de præſenti* producing its object, meer imperative words, ſuch as *fiat lux*, *let there be light*; and the reſt mentioned *pag.* 115. are no affirmative propoſitions, but meer commands. Doth God affirm every thing to be which he commands to be? What, a Jeſuite, and not able to diſtinguiſh betwixt one affirmative propoſition, and a word of command? If any of his inſtances ſeem to be to the purpoſe, it's that *Joh.* 15. *This is my command, that ye love one another.* But neither is that an affirmative propoſition *de præſenti*, producing its object. I hope the Diſciples were bound to love one another before that, conſequently the command of mutual love had a previous exiſtence. If therefore it be asked, what Chriſt meant by *hoc*, *This*, in that propoſition, I do not ſay with the Pamphleter, that he meant nothing determinately, till the whole propoſition was uttered, but he meant the command of loving one another, which was in force before he uttered that propoſition; and that the following words, that *ye love one another*, are added but exegetically, that the Diſciples might underſtand, what was the particular command he meant. And truly the Diſciples had as much need of this explication, after the prolation of the predicate as of the ſubject. For when he had ſaid, *This is my Commandment*, they had yet been at a loſs what the command was, unleſs he had ſubjoyned this explication. If it be enquired, may not an affirmative propoſition *de præſenti* be a command *quoad primum ſuum eſſe*, and have its ſelf for its object? *Anſw.* Though that were, yet would it not follow that an affirmative propoſition *de præſenti* is productive of its object; I ſuppoſe Philoſophers ſuffici-

ſufficiently demonſtrate that it is repugnant to reaſon that a thing ſhould produce it ſelf, at leaſt, as to its firſt being? In that caſe it would only follow that the propoſition were a formal command, or a ſignification of the will of God, obliging to obedience; but not that the propoſition ſhould be a command, and yet produce the command; that I ſuppoſe were ſtill a contradiction.

As there is no ſolidity in his retortion, ſo neither in his poſitive anſwer which thus he delivers, *The propoſition of Chriſt* (ſaith he) *is true in the inſtant of Nature*; ſed non pro inſtanti Naturæ, *but not for the inſtant of Nature, even as to day I may truly affirm what will be to morrow.* If I miſtake not, he ſtill involves himſelf in contradictions. As to day he cannot truly affirm, *de præſenti* what ſhall only be to morrow, ſo neither can he in this inſtant of Nature truly affirm *de præſenti* what ſhall only be in the next. When a propoſition for any inſtant, whether of time or nature, affirms that to be *de præſenti*, which is not in that inſtant, that propoſition is ſurely diſconform to its object, and conſequently falſe. If therefore that may truly be affirmed *de preſenti*, which is not *de præſenti*, then the propoſition ſhould be both true and falſe; true, and not true, at once. Nor do *I deſtroy all practical knowledge*, as he ignorantly affirms, by denying that an affirmative propoſition *de præſenti* can be productive of its object. Who beſide him ever affirmed *that all practical knowledge affirms its object to be before it is?* Were not this indeed to make all practical knowledge to imply a contradiction? Now, whether he or I deſerve his civil Complements of a *Don Quick-Sott*, and whether their figment of Tranſubſtantiation, or the Doctrine of reformed Churches, concerning the ſenſe of this propoſition of Chriſt, be the *Chymer* and *Windmill of giddy brains*, is remitted to the Judgment of unbyaſſed perſons.

SECT. II.

The Pamphleters Superficial reflexions on the number and Nature of Sacraments, examined.

CONcerning the number of Sacraments, I had the more largely inſiſted in my Tenth Paper, becauſe Mr. *Dempſter*

ſter had Solemnly appealed me to prove the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches as to that thing. But how Scabrous a Reply is given by the Pamphleter from *p.* 115. they who indifferently compare both may judge. The enumeration of the pamphleters omiſſions in this one queſtion would draw long, I mention but one, though each of the five Romiſh Sacraments, Confirmation, Pennance, Marriage, extream Unction, and Orders were ſeverally confuted, yet this Ghoſt of Mr. *Dempſters* had not the confidence to examin what was objected againſt any of them.

To Supply thoſe defects, he betakes himſelf, as his cuſtome is, to ſome impertient clamours. As 1. *That this tenet of two Sacraments and no more, is a fundemental of the Proteſtant Religion.* 2. *that this is peculiar to us, all the reſt of our Tenets being derived from other Hereticks.* 3. *That it was a year before this anſwer to* Mr. *Dempſters, query did appear.* To begin with the laſt of theſe, I anſwer, that my Reply to Mr. *Dempſters* tenth paper was inreadineſs within a moneth, and communicated to ſome friends, but could not be delivered through Mr. *Dempſters* diſappearing. To the firſt of the other two, I anſwer, its a manifeſt falſhood did I not prolixly ſhew that if there be any controverſy in Divinity, wherein an adverſary may wrap himſelf up in Logomachies, this is it. And that as the word Sacrament is explained more or fewer, may be aſſerted. Ought not proteſtants to know what are the fandamentalls of their one Religion better then a Romaniſt? Doth not learned *Whittaker prælect. de Sac. q. 6. cap. 2.* declare that any errour in this matter *non eſt capitalis.* Indeed the preciſe ſeptenary of Sacraments is a fundamentall of the Romiſh Religion, and therefore the Council of *Trent. Seſ. 7. Can.* 1. hath anathematized all that hold any otherwiſe, yet I hope this foundation was Sufficiently overthrown in my laſt. To the ſecond, I anſwer that Papiſts Simbolizing with Hereticks, hath been demonſtrated in many particulars, but our concurrence with them in one reall Hereſy hath not been proved, nor can be, by all the Caball of Jeſuits. As to the Doctrine of two Sacrements, the *Magdeburgians Cent.* 12. *Cap.* 6. *Col.* 1206. from an ancient manuſcript ſhew that it was one of the Poſitions of the *Waldenſes, Duo eſſe Eccleſiæ Sacramenta, Baptiſmum & cœnam Domini*, either then the *Waldenſes* wer Proteſtants, which is contrary to what he ſaid before, or it is falls, that this is peculiar to proteſtants. Were not *Juſtin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian Ambroſe,*

Chrysost. Austin, &c. of the same mind? He may remember *Austins numero Pauciſſima, Epiſt.* 118. and his *Gemina, lib.* 2. *de Symbol. ad Catech. cap.*6. and other touches of Antiquity to this purpoſe in my tenth, which yet wait for his examination. His gloſs upon *Auſtins gemina, that he meant only two chief Sacraments,* is to dilute, he might as well ſay, there are but two Planets, or that *Jacob* had but two Sons, meaning two chief ones. But why ſhould theſe only be called the two chief Sacraments, ſeeing according to Romaniſts, Pennance is more neceſſary to Salvation then the Euchariſt? I appealled my adverſary to Inſtance ſo much as one Father that affirmed a preciſe ſeptenary of Sacraments, ſhould we not heard of it, if it could have been given?

It's true that p. 122. He hath ſome inſignificant hints at *Denys* and *Auſtin*, and firſt he begins in *Luther, de cap. Bab. granting that* Denys *the Diſciple of* Paul *ſtood for ſeven Sacraments.* I have not that Book of *Luther* by me to try the Citation, But though the Pope would affirm it, as well as *Luther*, I can ſay, from an ocular inſpection, that it's a groſs miſtake. Yea, *Bell. l.* 2. *de Sac. in genere c.* 27. confeſſes that *Denys* in his Book *De Hierarch. Eccleſ.* (which was the proper place of treating of Sacraments) omits three of theRomiſh Sacraments, Matrimony, extream Unction and Pennance. Learned Criticks have demonſtrated that the works paſſing under the name of *Denys* the Areopagit, were not written by the Areopagit *Pauls* Diſciple, nor as appears within the three firſt Centuries, neither is that Author of the preſent Roman Faith, nay, on the contrary, he is ours as to the main ſubſtantials in controverſy, he is not for communions under one kind, nor for the Prieſts ſole receiving, nor for exhortations, leſſons, and Prayers in a Tongue, which people cannot underſtand, nor for invocation of Saints, or adoration of Images or Creatures, nor for praying for Souls in Purgatory, yea, nor for Tranſubſtantiation, *&c.* as may farther appear, *cap.*7. who will affirm he is for the Romiſh preciſe Septenary of proper Sacraments, neither more nor leſs, I may ſay, either he hath not read *Denys* with advertency, or he treſpaſſes againſt the principles of Ingenuity. If the Pamphleter can prove that τέλεται and μύησεις are taken by *Denys* in the ſtrict notion, wherein a Sacrament is uſed in this controverſie, and that they are applyed by him to the ſeven Sacraments pleaded by the Romaniſts, and to nothing elſe. I ſhall acknowledge

ledge I have learned a lesson from him. Next for *Austin, the Pamphleter says, he hath all the seven Sacraments, because forsooth in one place he gives the name of a Sacrament to one, and in another place to another*, but to pre-occupy that cavil in my Tenth paper against Mr. *Dempster*, I did advertise that *Austin* frequently uses the word Sacrament in a large sense, and attributes it to many things, which neither Papists nor we hold for Sacraments, as to the Sign of the Cross, meat given to Catechumens, yea to Polygamy, insomuch that *Bell. lib. 2. de sac. in gen. cap. 24. Sect. Lotionem pedum non esse Sacramentum*, acknowledges that not only *Austin*, but also other Fathers, as *Cyprian, Ambrose, Innocent.* 1. called many things by the name of Sacrament, which are not proper Sacraments What need I more, where ever said *Austin*, or any Father, that there be seven proper Sacraments neither more nor less? 'Till this be proved, is there not reason to hold Romanists as Innovators in this matter.

How comes this quibling Sophister, who answers nothing to what was objected against their five supposititious Sacraments to snarle *p.* 117. at the Scriptures which I brought to prove Baptism and the Lords Supper to be Sacraments, *viz. Act.* 2. 38, 39. 1 *Cor.* 11. 23, 24, 25. Is his Indignation so great that we admit not their five new coyned Romish Sacraments, that he would turn out of the Church Baptism and the Lords Supper, which beyond all, peradventure are of Divine Institution, and of perpetual observation in the Christian Church? Did he forget himself, when *pag.* 120. he brought one of the same Scriptures (at which here he cavils) to prove Baptism to be a Sacrament? Doth a Jesuits breath add significancy to a Scripture, which signifies nothing from a Protestant? Or is his choler moved *That I called Sacraments Seals of the Promises of Salvation?* Did not the Apostle call Circumcision, to which Baptisme hath succeeded *The Seal of the Righteousness which is by Faith, Rom.* 4 11. Is not Baptism by *Theod. lib. de Divin. decret. epitome*, called ἀρραβῶν τῶν μελλοντῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ τῆς ἐσομενῆς ἀναστάσεως τύπος, the earnest of future good things, and the type of the Resurrection to come. Doth not *Basil, lib.* 3. *contra Eunom.* say, πιστεῦσαι δεῖ προτερὸν ἐπεῖτα τῷ Βαπτίσματι ὀπισφραγισασθαι, we must first Believe and then be Sealed by Baptism; what should I cite *Tertul. de pænit.* or *Austin lib.* 4. *de Bapt cap.* 24. might he not have learned from *Valent* the *Jesuite Tom.* 4 *Disp.* 3.

q. 3. *Punt.* 1. That Sacraments are in a manner Seals of Divine Promiſes? Doth he not alſo *Punct.* 3. compare Sacraments to the Seals of Princes annexed to their Patents? Ought he not at leaſt to have been better acquainted with the Roman Catechiſm ſet forth by *Pope Pius Quintus*, which teaches *part.* 2 *cap.* 1. *q.* 7. that when Chriſt had promiſed forgiveneſs of ſin, and heavenly grace, he did inſtitute ſenſible ſigns, *Quibus eum quaſi pignoribus obligatum haberemus, atque ita fidelem in promiſſis futurum nunquam dubitaremus*, that is, whereby we might have him obliged as it were by pledges, and ſo we might never doubt of his fidelity in his promiſes? Who could deſire a more full explication of Sacramental Seals? Doth not the Scriptures at which he cavils, ſufficiently hold forth that Sacraments are inſtituted for the obſignation of promiſes? Is not this the ground upon which *Peter*, *Act.* 2. 38, 39. exhorts thoſe to be Baptiſed for the Remiſſion of Sins, becauſe the promiſe was theirs; if the Promiſe was theirs, then their ſins were already pardoned, and ſo Baptiſm was to be adminiſtred for the obſignation of the Promiſe. But ſays he, there is no mention of Salvation in that Scripture, how childiſh is this objection? Is not Salvation contained in the Promiſe? Is there not an Infallible connexion betwixt remiſſion of Sin and Salvation, *Rom.* 8. *Whom he juſtifies, them he glorifies?* Doth he Seal to any remiſſion of Sin, to whom he ſeals not Salvation? Can the other Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 11. *This Cup is the New-Teſtament*, bear any other tolerable ſenſe, but that the Cup, that is, the Conſecrated liquor in the Cup, was a Seal of the New-Covenant? Can any Romaniſt deny that this propoſition, *The Cup is the New-Teſtament* is figurative? Can any ſay that the Cup was Tranſubſtantiated into the New-Teſtament? If it could have born another congruous ſenſe, ought it not to have been declared when this Sophiſter was quarreling at the ſenſe given by me, what needs more, doth not *Eſtbius* a Popiſh Commentator *in loc.* give this ſenſe, That which is contained in this Cup, is that by which the New-Teſtament, *Sancitur & confirmatur*, is ratified and confirmed.

Was it pertinent for this Caviller when oppugning our Doctrine of the Sacraments, being Seals of the Covenant, to digreſs as he doth *pag.* 120. to another queſtion, *Concerning the efficacy of Sacraments?* Do we deny their efficacy? God forbid. The Pamphleter tracing the footſteps of *Bell. lib.* 2. *de effect. Sacr.*

Sac. cap. 2. ſays, *We make Sacraments but* nuda ſigna, *bare ſigns.* But this is an egregious Calumny, as may appear not only by the private Writings of Proteſtants, but by our publick confeſſions, particularly the *Scottiſh* confeſſion, *Art.* 21. *Quicunq; nobis detrahunt quaſi affirmaremus vel crederemus Sacramenta nihil aliud eſſe quam nuda & vacua ſigna, injuriam nobis faciunt & contra manifeſtam veritatem loquuntur*, ſo alſo the *Belgick* confeſſion, *Art.* 33. We do indeed deny that Sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato*, as the Council of *Trent* hath defined, *Seſſ.* 7. *Can.* 8. *Bell. lib.* 2. *de effect. Sac. cap.* 1. acknowledges *opus operatum*, to be ill Latine, but it is worſe Divinity, unknown to Scripture and ancient Fathers. Our Learned *Whittaker prælect. de Sacr. in genere q.* 4. *cap.* 1. ſuppoſes *Scotus* the quodlibetick Schoolman to have been the firſt Inventor of that barbarous Phraſe. The inconſiſtency of Popiſh Doctors with themſelves, and with Scriptures, and Fathers in this matter, is largly proved by the ſame Author, and by Chamier, *lib.* 2. *de Sac. in genere* from *cap.* 1. to *cap.* 11. and *Gerard loc. com. de Sacr. cap.* 9. *Sect.* 1. 2, 3. Only I would be reſolved what Sacramental grace this is which *Bell.* and other Romaniſts ſay is produced by the Sacrament? for they manifeſtly diſtinguiſh it from Faith, Repentance, and Love. And how *Bell.* ſays, that Sacraments ſometimes produce the firſt grace, and yet this *opus operatum*, ever preſuppoſes Faith, Repentance, and holy affections and diſpoſitions of the ſubject, ſhall it preſuppoſe theſe graces, and yet produce the firſt grace. It ſhall be time to me to confute you, when you come to underſtand your ſelves.

Though this Pamphleter lays aſide my definition of a Sacrament, not daring to tell why, yet I will uſe him with more Candour, for *pag.* 120. this definition he inſinuates, *That Sacraments are viſible or ſenſible ſigns of the inviſible grace they produce in the Soul, as Inſtituted by Chriſt our Lord for ſanctification, and in this ſenſe*, ſaith he, *there be ſeven ſet down in the Goſpel.* Behold the Fox! ſhould he not have ſaid, and no more, as the Council of *Trent* hath defined? What a disjunctive is this he gives, for the genus, viſible or ſenſible ſigns? are theſe reciprocal terms? Is every ſenſible ſigne viſible? Or if a Sacrament muſt be a viſible ſigne, what needed the word ſenſible? Doth not this deſcription agree to things which neither Papiſts nor Proteſtants hold for Sacraments, as to the Preaching of the Goſpel, its a ſenſible ſign, *&c.* Nay more, this deſcription, though many

many ways peccant, doth decart moſt, if not all their five ſpurious Sacraments, either they are not viſible or ſenſible ſigns, or are not inſtituted by Chriſt, or at leaſt not to produce our ſanctification? Was Balſamated oyle in Confirmation Inſtituted by Jeſus, *&c.* doth not Jeſuit *Suarez* in 3. *p. tom.* 3. *q.* 72. *diſp.* 3. *ſect.* 1. *&c.* acknowledge the contrary? He may ask at *Hugo de S. Victore*, *Lombard*, *Bonaventure*, *Alenſis*, and *Altiſiodorenſis*, whether their extream Unction was inſtituted by Jeſus, what I pray is the viſible ſenſible Sign inſtituted by Chriſt in Marriage and Pennance? Were Marriage and Orders inſtituted to produce grace? It would be ſupererogation to add any more againſt theſe five Sacraments, until he have anſwered what I wrote in my tenth paper againſt Mr. *Dempſter.*

But doth not this Pamphleter bring ſome Scriptures for the controverted Sacraments *Pag.* 121. I confeſs he doth, but ſuch as conclude nothing for him, all theſe having been often vindicated by Proteſtants from the detorſion of Romaniſts, yea, ſome of them wer touched in my tenth reply to Mr. *Dempſter* yet he ſets down the Scriptures barely, as if they contained *in terminis* his poſition, ſuch is the daring boldneſs of Jeſuites, as if their Dictates and gloſſes upon Scripture were to be received without any reaſon.

For Confirmation he cites two places, *Act.* 17. he ſhould have ſaid *Act.* 8. 17. and 2 *Cor.* 1. 22. But neither of theſe prove the preſent Romiſh confirmation to be a proper Sacrament; Not the firſt, in which its only ſaid, *Then laid they their hands upon them, i. e.* theſe that believed, *And they received the Holy Ghoſt*, is there here any mention of Oyle or of Balſome, which Pope *Eugenius* the Fourth, and the Council of *Florence*, *in Decreto ad Inſtruct Armen.* and the Roman Catechiſm, *Part.* 2. *cap.* 3. *q* 6. affirm to be the matter of this Sacrament, or is there mention of theſe words which the Pope and Catechiſm *q.* 10. call the Form of this Sacrament, *viz. ſigno te ſigno crucis, &c.* Doth not *Eſtbius* in 4. *Sent. Diſt.* 7. *Sect.* 7. confeſs this to be the more common opinion of Romaniſts, that the Apoſtles uſed no Unction in Confirmation, how then can an Argument be drawn from this Scripture, that their Romiſh Confirmation is a Sacrament? In that Scripture there is only mention of impoſition of hands, but in their Confirmation there is no impoſition of hands, (as *Dallæus* learnedly proves, *de Confirmatione lib.* 1. *cap.* 6.) but

but only an anointing and croſſing the Forehead with the Balſamated Oyle by the finger of a Biſhop, which can no more properly be termed Impoſition of hands, then the ſprinkling of water in Baptiſm upon an Infant, can be ſo called. Did ever any ancient Father expound theſe words of Anointing and Croſſing with Balſamated Oyle? Are not Romaniſts then manifeſt Innovators, who have ſubſtitute a Sacrament of Balſamated Oyle, which hath no veſtige in that, or any other Scripture? Beſides, Sacraments are exhibitive of ſanctifying grace. But how can it be proved, that by the Holy Ghoſt which here is ſaid to be received, are meant the ſanctifying Graces, and not the edifying Gifts of the Spirit, ſuch as the gifts of Tongues, Miracles, *&c.* which in the Popiſh Schools paſs under the Name of *gratia gratis data?* Sure theſe *Samaritans* were Baptized, Believed and received the word of God, *Act.* 8. *v.* 12. 13. 14 before *Peter* and *John* came down to them, and ſo had the ſanctifying graces of the Spirit, but the Holy Ghoſt, as here ſpoken of, had fallen upon none of them, *verſ.* 16. Undoubtedly therefore by the Holy Ghoſt here are meant the edifying gifts of the Spirit, and not ſanctifying graces. Was not the falling of the Spirit upon theſe believing *Samaritans*, like the falling of the ſpirit on theſe of *Ceſarea*, *Act.* 10. 44, 45. and theſe *Act.* 19. 6. on whom *Paul* laid his hands, but there ſurely the edifying gifts of the Spirit are meant, for preſently it is added, they Propheſied and ſpoke with Tongues. Had it been otherwiſe, how could *Simon Magus* ſo eaſily have diſcerned that they had received the Holy Ghoſt? The ſanctifying graces of the Spirit are not eaſily diſcernible, but edifying gifts, as ſpeaking with Tongues do clearly manifeſt themſelves. But though it were given that ſome ſanctifying graces had been conferred by the laying on of the hands of the Apoſtles, doth it therefore follow that it was a proper Sacrament? Is every ſenſible ſign by which grace is conferred, a Sacrament? Is not the Spirit given by Prayer, and by Preaching of the Word, which yet are no Sacraments. How great things do Romaniſts aſcribe to their Crucifixes and Holy Water, which yet they make not Sacraments? What ſhould I ſpeak of that Traſh of outward Ceremonies which are added to Baptiſm, Exſufflations, Spittle, Oyle, Salt, *&c*, are all theſe Sacraments? Doth not *Bel. lib. de Bapt. cap.* 25. *Sect* 10. relate from *Auſtin* of Sanctifying of Catechumens by the Impoſition

of

of hands of presbiters, yet that was not a Sacrament, did not Christ himself bless young children by imposition of hands, *Mat.* 19. 13. 15. Yet *Soto*, *Coninck*, and generally the rest of the Popish Doctors deny that to be the Sacrament of Confirmation? Was not Imposition of hands in solemn benedictions an ancient Jewish rite, as may appear by *Gen.* 48. 14. *Numb.* 27. 18, 19, 23. 2 *King.* 5. 11. *Mark* 7. 32. and so not first institut by Jesus. Lastly, some practices of the Apostles make not always a perpetual standing Rule for the Church. But more for the vindication of that Scripture, together with a confutation of all *Bellarmins* cavils, may be seen in *Dallæus Disp. de Confirm*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 6. 9, 10, 11, 12. as for the *other Scripture* for *Confirmation*, from 2 *Cor.* 1. 21, 22. there is mention indeed of establishing and anointing, but its manifest from *vers.* 22. it was with no material oyle, but by the Holy Ghost, and so much is acknowledged by *Esthius* on the place. Is not Christ said to be anointed, *Psal.* 45. 7. *Isa.* 61. 1. dare he say it is with material oyle? Is there not a parallel Scripture, 1 *John.* 2. 27. *The anointing which he have received of him abideth in you, and it teacheth you all things.* But sure that is a mystical Unction by the Spirit, for it abides, is Internal, and teaches all things, which, without too violent a *Catachresis*, cannot be ascribed to Romish Confirmation.

For Pennance he cites other two Scriptures, Joh. 20. 23. *whose Sins ye shall forgive, are forgiven*; and *Act.* 16. 18. *And many of them that Believed, came confessing their Deeds.* Both these places are sufficiently vindicated by *Fulk* against the Rhemists. In a word, it shall be enough to me to say that these Scriptures prove a Ministerial power of absolution, and that distressed Consciences may disburden their Spirits, by laying open their sins to faithful Pastors, and in case of publick Scandal, publick confession of Sin should be made. All these Protestants do grant; but that every one is bound necessarily to reveal all his particular sins, how secret soever, by auricular confessing to a Priest, and that he hath power to impose proper satisfactions to Divine Justice, as Romanists teach concerning the Sacrament of Pennance. Neither these nor any other Scriptures hold out. Nor is there a visible sign, such as I shew in my tenth paper against Mr. *Dempster* to be necessary to the being of a Sacrament here Instituted by Christ.

For

For *extream Unction, he cites* Jam. 5. 14. *and* Mark 6. 13. Did I not ſhew in my laſt againſt Mr. *Dempſter, pag.* 266. *That Bell. lib.* 2. *de Extream Unct. cap.* 2. *Janſen. Concord. cap.* 55. *Coninck Tom.* 2. *de Sacrat. Diſp.* 111. *Dub.* 1. *Num.* 3. as alſo *Suarez, a lapide, Carleton,* and many others deny that in the latter place *Mark* 6. 13. any Sacrament is held out, ought he not to have examined *Bellarmins* arguments to the contray? did I not alſo *ibid.* 1. ſhew that *Cardinall Cajetan, Comment. in Jam.* 5. affrms that from theſe words, *Jam.* 5. 14. 15. no Sacrament can be concluded, and he ſays as much, of that place *Mark* 6. ſo that both theſe places are declared by eminent Doctors of the Romiſh Church to ſignify nothing as to the purpoſe in hand. Did I not alſo plainly tell that both theſe Scriptures treat of an Unction in reference to a miraculous healing of diſeaſed perſons? Ought not this interpretation to have been refuted, if he had intended to Satisfy thoſe that are judicious? Many arguments might be heaped up to confirm the interpretation I have given. I hint but at a few things. And, *Firſt*, that of *Mark* treats not of a Sacramental Unction, as is acknowledged by the moſt eminent Champions for the Romiſh cauſe already cited, to whom *Greg. de Val. Dominicus a Soto, Ruardus* and many others may be added, and who will deny it, muſt anſwer both *Bellarmins* arguments, and alſo theſe brought by our Divines. Therefore neither is there any Sacrament in *James*. For any, who with indifferency of Spirit, will compare the two places, will find them exactly parallel, and this the Jeſuit *Maldonat on Mark c.* 6. hath ſufficiently proved, albeit his heat for the Romiſh intereſt made him falſly to imagine a Sacramental inſtitution, *Mark* 6. 13. *Secondly* Sacraments are not *principally* inſtituted for the body, but chiefly at leaſt, if not only for the *ſoul*. But both theſe Unctions, *Mark* 6. and *Jam.* 5. are chiefly for the body, In *Mark* 6. mention is only made of bodily cure, In *Jam.* 5. the healing of the body is both firſt and abſolutely Spoken of, and forgiveneſs of ſin only in the ſecond place, and alſo conditionally, therefore in neither place have we a proper Sacrament. *Thirdly*, the Romiſh greaſy Unction is only adminiſtred to thoſe that are deſperatly Sick, of whoſe recovery there is no hope, but the Vnction Spoken of by *Mark* and *James*, are not at all reſtricted to theſe, therefore the preſent Romiſh Unction is different from them both. *Fourthly*, if *James* words are to be underſtood of Extream Unction, why are Elders in the

plural appointed to be called for, ſeeing only one can officiat in that matter. *Laſtly*, not to repeat what was objected againſt this in my laſt, is it probable that if this had been a Sacrament inſtituted by Chriſt, that the Fathers in the firſt three Centuries would have made no mention thereof, how comes it that we hear not of it either in the conſtitutions under the Name of *Clement*, or in *Denys*, whom they hold for the *Areopagit* in his *lib. de Hierarch.* had they not convenient opportunity of it? Indeed *Denys* ſpeaks of an anointing the Dead, but of Unction of the Sick he hath no mention. That it was wholly unknown to the ancient Churh is learnedly proven by *Dallæus de extrem. Unct. lib.* 2. who alſo examins all the Cavills of Romaniſts for this pretended Sacrament.

For Orders, he cites 2 *Timoth.* 1. 6. *Stir up the gift which is in thee, by laying on of my hands*, the moſt that this place proves is, that ordination is a ſtanding Ordinance in the Church, which the proteſtant Churches do not deny, but no way conclude it a proper *Sacrament*. I hope nothing needs to be added againſt this pretended *Sacrament*, till he anſwer what is objected againſt Mr. *Dempſter*, only I muſt remember him that *Etius* on the place confeſſes that the gifts here ſpoken of are *Timothies* Miniſterial endowments, conſequently the grace here ſpoken of not being Sanctifying, nor impoſition of hands being a Sufficient Sacramentall ſign, as I ſhew againſt Mr. *Dempſter* nothing can be hence concluded as to a proper Sacrament, albeit *Calvin* as I advertiſed them grants that in a large Senſe it may be termed a Sacrament. *For Matrimony he only cites Epheſ.* 5. 32. *which thus he renders, this Sacrament is great*, but according to the originall it is, *this is a great* myſtery. Is every thing which the Scripture calls a myſtery a Sacrament with them, then the *myſtery of iniquity.* 2 *Theſ.* 2. 7. *and the myſtery of the whore Babylon. Revel.* 17. 5. 7. muſt alſo be Sacraments, but doth not the Apoſtle Signify what it is he means by that myſtery *Epheſ.* 5. 32. when he Subjoyns, *I Speake of Chriſt and the Church*, what need I more, Seing I brought in my laſt againſt Mr. *Dempſter*, there own great Cardinall *Cajetan* confeſſing that from this place it doth not follow that Matrimony is a Sacrament. But if he had not been ſmitten with Mr. *Dempſters* tergiverſing Diſeaſe, he had never wholly overleaped what I objected againſt this, and the reſt of their five ſpurious Sacraments, if he have any Candor, its expected in his next, he will

reply

reply not only to these hints, but also to what was objected in my last.

By all this I hope it appears that the Doctrine of the Protestant Churches concerning the presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and concerning the number of Sacraments remains unshaken, what unity Romanists can pretend to in this question of the number of Sacraments, I leave to be gathered from these two Testimonies. The first shall be of *Greg. de Val. the Jesuite, lib. de num. Sacr. cap.* 3. & 7. *Some Catholicks, saith he, denies Matrimony, others Confirmation,* and others *extream Unction to be univocally a Sacrament.* The other of *Cassander, Consult. art.* 13. *apud authores* (saith he) *Paulo vetutiores inter Sacramenta proprie dicta nunc duo ponuntur, nunc tria, Baptismus, Eucharistia, & Confirmatio non temere quenquam reperies ante Lombardum qui certum aliquem & definitum numerum statuerit, & de his septem non omnes quidem Scholastici æque proprie Sacramentum vocabant.*

CHAP. VI.

Whether Proteſtant Churches do grant that the Viſible Church was not always preſerved, and that for 1400. *years before* Luther, *Popery was the only prevailing Religion.*

IT may ſeem ſtrange that I ſhould be put to Debate this queſtion, having ſo often appealed Mr. *Dempſter* to try the Truth of Religion, not only by its conformity with the holy Scriptures, but alſo with the Faith of the ancient Church. But ſo evil natur'd is this Ghoſt of Mr. *Dempſter*, that as if I were too narrow a Mark for his reviling genius, he ſpends one entire Section, from *pag.* 125. *to* 129. in a calumnious repreſentation of the Proteſtant Churches, *as if the more ancient Proteſtants had affirmed that the Viſible Church had periſhed from the days of the Apoſtles, and that the only prevailing Religion for* 1400. *years before* Luther *had been Popery.* For this end he has ſcraped together out of his common Place-Books a multitude of broken ſhreds from Proteſtant Authors, from which he deduces ſundry abſurd inferences, of which the Authors never once dreamed; how deſperate muſt the Romiſh Cauſe be, when they cannot impugne us, but by miſrepreſenting us, and charging upon us Tenets which they know we condemn? Yea, though we diſown them, yet they will ſtill impoſe them upon us. When they thus ſport with their own Shadows, do they not gallantly confute the Proteſtant Religion?

To aſſoyle therefore the Proteſtant Churches in this matter, and to demonſtrate that our Adverſaries play but the Sycophants, theſe enſuing obſervations may be noticed.

And firſt, the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches is not to be meaſured by the ſentiments of private Doctors, of what fame ſoever, but by their ſolemn Confeſſions of Faith, long ago publiſhed to the world, purpoſely to prevent ſuch miſrepreſentations. The harmony whereof, in the ſubſtantials of Faith

Faith penned by men of ſo many different Nations, under no common juriſdiction, and of ſo different complexions as to other things, is next to a miracle, and may be ſufficient, to confute the pretended neceſſity of an infallible viſible judge. But in this preſent debate the Adverſary brings not one Sentence out of theſe Confeſſions, but only from the writings of private Doctors, yea, ſome of them not only of ſmall account, but alſo diſowned by the more judicious, as being no Proteſtants at all. Would Romaniſts be content that we hold the Sentiments of their moſt famous Doctors, ſuch as *Cajetan*, *Durandus*, *Gerſon*, *Ferus*, &c. much more of theſe who have apoſtatized from them for the Doctrine of their Church. Why then deal they with us by other meaſures then they would be dealt with themſelves.

Secondly, much leſs are broken ſhreds from Proteſtant authors, violently detorted contrary to their known judgment in other their writings to be taken for the ſtandard of the Reformed Religion. Yet ſuch are moſt of the Teſtimonies which *Breerly Knot*, *H. T.* &c. and this filching Pamphleter (who licks up their excrements) doe make uſe of in this queſtion. *Did Dr. John White*, *Whitaker*, *Chillingworth*, *Calvin*, *Jewel*, *Chemnitius*, *the Centuriſts*, *&c. maintain that there were none that profeſſed the Religion of Proteſtants from the days of the Apoſtles until Luther*, *or that Popery was the only Prevailing Religion for* 1400. *Years before Luther?* Nay on the contrary, doth not *Dr. John White* in his way to the Church *ſect.* 17. Peremptorily affirm, *that this faith which we profeſſe hath ſucceſſively continued in all ages ſince Chriſt*, *and was never interrupted*, *not ſo much as one year*, *moneth or day.* Doth not *Chillingworth c.* 5. *ſect.* 9. when he is pondering ſuch Teſtimonies of *Jewel*, *Naper*, *Brocard*, *&c.* as are cited by the Pamphleter, declare they never meant that the viſible Church had totally failed, but only from its purity? Doth not *Whitaker*, *Controv.* 2. *c.* 5. *q.* 7. expreſly affirm *That we can prove out of the Fathers*, *our Doctrine to have been in the Church in all theſe ancient ages?* Doth he not a little after charge *Bellarmine* as belying *Calvin*, and the *Centuriſts*, as if when they charged the Fathers with theſe errors mentioned by this Pamphleter, *viz. Limbo*, *freewill*, *and merit of good works*, as if I ſay they had charged theſe on all the Fathers, and on all the Church; none of which they ever meant, ſaith *Whitaker.* Sure I am *Chemnitius*, *pag.* 200. at leaſt in that *Edit.* I have *Genev.* 1641. ſays not as the Pamphleter alleadges, *viz.* that moſt of the Fathers did avouch Invocation of Saints. But on the countrary affirms *pag.* 634.

634. *that for* 350. years after Christ, there was no Invocation of Saints *in publica praxi Ecclesiæ*, and that the first rise of it was about the year 370. in *Nazianzen* in *Basils* Panegyricks, by Rhetorical Apostrophes, and that also with an εἰ τις αἰδοῦνται, so far were they from maintaining it to be an article of Faith. It were tedious to go through all, amongst all these testimonies cited by the Pamphleter, there will not one be found, who affirm that Popery was the prevalent Religion for 1400 years before *Luther* except *Sebastian Frank* whom Dr. *Francis Whyte*, in the defence of Dr. *John White* against *T. W. pag.* 324. declares to be an Anabaptist, an unlearned, malapert hot spur; *Chemnitius* as the same Author testifies, calls him *hominem petulantem & indoctum* Did ever Protestants acknowledge that the body of the present Romish Religion was received by the ancient Church? such as half Communions, picturing and adoring Images of the Trinity, the whole present worship of the Virgin *Mary*, the performing the worship of God in an unknown Tongue, the necessity of an Infallible visible judge, the prohibiting of reading Scriptures in vulgar Tongues, Indulgences, the necessity of auricular Confession; the necessity of the Priests intention to make Sacraments effectual, the Popes Supremacy and Soveraignty over Princes, &c. Who is the Protestant that ever acknowledged these things to have been ever received in the Catholick Church? I profess I never read of him, nor I beleive shall he ever be found. Whereas *Jewel* said, *That Truth was not known untill the Preaching of* Luther *and* Zuinglius, that must surely be understood *secundum quid*, as Dr. *Francis Whyte* observes, *lib. cit. pag.* 267. for *Jewel* gave a most solemn challenge to Papists at *Pauls* Cross to make out one Article of their Religion out of one Father for 600. years after Christ, which challenge he prosecuted against *Harding*. What D. *John White saith in defence of his way, cap.* 37. *That Popery was a Leprosie breeding in the Church so Universally, that there was no visible company appearing in the world free from it*, makes nothing against what is said. Nay, in these words he distinguishes betwixt the Church and that Leprosie of Popery, and by saying, that it was a Leprosie in the Church, he affirms the existence of both. The meaning of the Doctor only was, that in these latter times, wherein Popish errors and superstition spread so far in this Western part of the World, though God preserved many from imbracing these errours, yet they kept external Communion with

with the reſt, even as thoſe ſeven thouſand in the days of *Elias* did with the reſt of *Iſrael*.

Thirdly, when ſome Fathers are charged with ſome errors, (which is all that theſe teſtimonies amount to) it doth not follow that all the Fathers were ſmitten therewith. Though *Cyprian* erred in the Rebaptization, though *Tertullian* did Montanize, Pope *Liberius* Arrianize, many *Aſiaticks* eſpouſe the *Quarto Deciman* opinion, *Origen* maintain poſitions which were juſtly anathematiz'd by the fifth general Council, yet I hope all the Fathers, much leſs the whole Church, was not leavened with theſe errors. Made I it not appear in my 9. paper againſt Mr. *Dempſter*, *pag.* 194. 195. that none are more profuſe in cenſuring Fathers then Romaniſts. *Bellarmine* ſpares not to ſay, *lib.* 1. *de Beat. Sanct. cap.*6. that *Juſtin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Epiphanius*, &c. cannot be defended; that *Tertullian* was an Arch-Heretick, and of no credit, *lib.* 1. *de S S. Beat. cap.*5. *and lib.* 4. *de Pontif. cap.* 8. That *Cyprian* did not only erre, but alſo mortally offend, *lib.* 4. *de Rom. Pontif. cap.* 7. that *Prudentius* ſpeaks like a Poet, and not like a Divine, *lib.* 2. *de Purg. cap.* 18. that *Jerom* was deceived, *lib.*1. *de Rom.Pontif.cap.*8. that *Auſtin* had no skill in the Hebrew, *lib.* 1. *de Pontif. cap.* 10. that himſelf little regarded *Damaſus* Pontifical, *lib.* 2. *de Rom. Pontif. cap.* 5. that *Sozomen* was a maniſeſt lyar, *lib.* 3. *de Pœnit. cap.* 14. Neither is it only ſingle Fathers they thus undervalue, but oft-times will prefer three before 7. two before eight, one before five, of all which Dr. *James* gives luculent inſtances, *part.* 4. yea, ſometimes they condemn whole Armies of Fathers, All the Fathers with one voice affirm, ſaith *Melchior Canus lib.* 7. *loc. com cap.* 1. *That the Virgin* Mary *was conceived in Original Sin. Chryſoſt. Euſeb. Ambroſe*, *Auſtin*, &c. and as Dr. *James* obſerves, ſome bring 200. others, 300. Fathers to confirm this opinion, yet what ſaith that Biſhop of the *Canaries* of all theſe, *Cum nullus Sanctorum contravenerit, infirmum tamen ex omnium authoritate argumentum ducitur, quin potius contrarium & probabiliter & pie in Eccleſia defenditur*, *i. e.* Its but a weak argument which is drawn from the Authority of all the Fathers, yea, the contrary, notwithſtanding their ſuffrages, may be piouſly defended. Are theſe the men who challenge us for undervaluing Fathers, who put ſuch contempt upon them? In very deed they regard no Fathers, further then they can ſerve their intereſt. Both Scriptures and Fathers muſt ſtoop to the authority of

of the present Church of Rome, that is the Pope.

How many bastard Fathers have they legitimated? How many true Fathers have they castrated? Hence is that observe of Dr. *Don*, in his *pseudo-Martyr cap.* 6. *Sect.* 30. according to Romanists the Scripture is a Divin Law, the writings or interpretations of Fathers a subdivin Law, but the decretalls of Popes a superdivin Law, whereunto Scripturs, Councils and Fathers must bend and bow. Yet I must do them right, they have one evasion, according to which they do wrong to no Father, for if the Pope prohibit the writings of such an Author, he ceases to be a Father, he is but as *Gretser* the Jesuit phraseth it, *Vitricus*, a step Father. Nor need Fathers complain of this usage, seeing the Pope usurps the like Authority upon the Scripturs of God. Neither shall Fathers be Fathers, nor Scriptures be Scriptures, except it please the Pope, Is not this that man of sin that exalts himself above all that is called God?

I deny not but some Protestants, may have been too rash in their censurs of Fathers, perhaps not fully penetrating the scope of Fathers, or not distinguishing betwixt their genuine and supposititious writings, have supposed them to favour errors, from which others; yea and somtimes the same authors also upon better advisment have vindicated them. As I cannot in this wholly justify the *Magdeburgion Centuriists*, so I cannot but notice how this *Pampbleter* hath either through ignorance or malice injured them. He brings in the *Centuriists reprehending Cyprian, Origen and Tertul: in the third Century, and Nazianzen in the fourth, for teaching Peters primacy, and again reprehending Cyprian, for owning the sacrifice of the Mass, and generally confessing that the Fathers of the third age did witness the invocation of Saints*, It's true the *Magdeburgians. Cent.* 3. *cap.* 4. *tit. de inclinatione Doctrinæ*, seem to say somthing of *Cyprian* and *Tertull*, as favouring primacy, yet *cap.* 7. *tit. de primatu*, they not only affirm, but positively undertake to demonstrate, that the head-ship and supremacy of the Bishop, or Church of Rome was acknowledged by none in that age, and particularly they say, that *Origen* never asserted the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, and bring in *Cyprian* giving luculent testimonies against it in his debates with *Cornelius*, and *Stephanus* Bishops of Rome. Yea and they explain those other expressions

of

of *Cyprian* which ſeemed to favour primacy, as making nothing for that ſupremacy which Romaniſts now plead for. So likewiſe *Cent.* 4. *cap.* 7. *tit. de primatu. Pag.* 314. *edit. Baſil.* 1624. They deny that *Nazianzen* ever aſſerted any primacy of the Biſhop of Rome but *primatum ordinis*. Concerning the Sacrifice of the Maſs, the *Magdeburgians*, *Cent.* 3. *Cap.* 4. *pag.* 42. Expreſly affirm that no Sacrifice was acknowledged either in the ſecond or third Century but of Chriſt on the Croſs, except euchariſtike Sacrifices of prayer and praiſe, *&c.* and confirm their aſſertion not only from other Fathers, but alſo from *Cyprian*. It's true *Cyprian* and other Fathers called the euchariſt a Sacrifice, but they meant only a commemorative Sacrifice, as is largly demonſtrated by Dr. *Morton*, *lib.* 6. *of the inſtitution of the Sacrament*. Concerning invocation, the *Centuriſts* do not ſay that the Fathers of the third age did witneſs invocation of Saints, but only that veſtiges of it were to be found in their Writings, and herein perhaps they have diſcovered a little of their unadviſedneſs, for the chief ground of this their aſſertion they take from ſome ſuppoſititious writings of *Origen*, particularly his commentaries on *Job*, which not only our Critiks *Cocus*, *pag.* 68. *Rivet Crit. ſac. lib.* 2. *cap.* 13. *Scultet. medul. pat. lib.* 6. *cap.* 2. *pag.* 124. but alſo *Eraſmus*, *Genebrard*, *Sixtus Senenſis*, *lib.* 4. *bibl.* and *Peſſevin* the Jeſuit *appar. verbo*, *Origenes* have declared to be ſpurious.

But yet the Pamphleter objects *that the Centuriſts affirm that Irenæus*, *Clement*, *and all the Doctors of the ſecond age did admit free will even in ſpiritual actions*, *to whom both they and Abraham Scultet* (ſays he) *adds Cyprian*, *Theophilus*, *Tertul*, *Origen*, *Clemens of Alexandria*, *Juſtin*, *Athenagoras*, *Tatianus*, &c. But this Pamphleter diſcovers that either he has never read the *Centuriſts* and *Scultet*, or that he is moſt perfidious in his citations. For the *Centuriſts Cent.* 2. *cap.* 46. *col.* 46. after that they had ſaid ſomthing to that purpoſe of the Fathers of the ſecond Century, preſently ſubjoyn, *videmus interdum hos liberi arbitrij aſſertores*, *ſibi ipſis contracia dicere*, *ac paulo alicubi commodius ſentire*, ſo that when all is put together, the *Centuriſts* ſay, theſe Doctors were inconſtant to themſelves in that matter, and *Scultet* in his *Medul. pat. edit. franco-furt.* 1634. charges with inconſtancy in this thing *pag.* 83. *Irenæus pag.* 38. *Juſtin Martyr pag.* 119. *Clemens of Alexandria pag.* 245. *Cyprian pag.* 52,

he pronounces *Tatianus* an heretick, and in particular that he mantained that the Soul dyed with the Body, *pag.* 135. he charges *Theophilus Antiochenus* with Arrianism, and *Origen* with contradictions in many chief poynts of Religion, of *Tertullian*, *pag.* 243. he says that he wrot more grosly of free-will then *Pelagius* himself, if Jesuits will take him for their Patron in this matter they may. But what is all this to the point, do Protestants deny free-will in regenerat persons about supernatural actions? No verily, we abominat *Manicheism* and *Stoicism*. That which we deny is free-will in unregenerat persons about actions spiritual and acceptable before God. Did not *Austin* with the Catholick Church affirm as much? hence *Enchirid*, *cap.* 30. *man abusing his free-will lost both himself and it.* And again, *cum libero arbitrio peccaret homo, vitiore peccato amissum est liberum arbitrium*, and *lib. de corrupt. & gra. cap.* 11. *liberum arbitrium ad malum sufficit, ad bonum nihil sufficit nisi adjuvetur ab omnipotente Deo.* More to the like purpose may be seen *de Spir. & lit. cap.* 3. *and lib.* 3. *contra duas epist. pelag. cap.* 6. *&c.* We also deny that the efficacy of grace in conversion depends upon the beck of mans free-will, and so did *Austin* with the Catholick Church before us, *lib. de corrupt & gra. cap.* 12. *subventum est igitur infirmitati voluntatis humanæ, ut divina gratia indeclinabiliter & insuperabiliter ageretur* and *cap.* 14. *volenti salvum facere nullum hominum resistit arbitrium.* So likewise *lib.* 1. *ad Simplic. quæst.* 2 *lib. cont. duas. Epist. Pelag. cap.* 19. I know *Bellarmin* has made a far greater muster of Fathers for the Jesuits, Pelagian Doctrin of free-will *lib.* 5. *de gra. & lib. arb. cap.* 25. 26. But the Fathers are judiciously vindicated in that point by the learned *David Paræus* in his animadversions on these capp. In a word what ever were the opinions of these Fathers as to the matter of free-will, it doth not follow that they or all the Fathers in these Centuries, did embrace the whole System of the present *Tridentin* Faith? Do not both the *Centuristæ* and *Scultet* make it their work to demonstrat that the Fathers in these Centuries had no kindness for the present Romish Religion.

Not to wast time and paper upon all the impertinent allegations of the *Pamphleter*, on litrle touch I must give concerning Mr. *Luther*. I am not concerned to justify all his harsh

harſh expreſſions of the Fathers. Did not *Moſes* himſelf ſpeak ſomtimes unadviſedly with his lips? Yet this I muſt advertiſe the Reader, that the *colloquia menſalia* (out of which moſt of theſe expreſſions are taken, which Romaniſts uſually object in their rants) are called by Dr. *Francis Whyte* in his Orthodox Faith againſt *T. W.* a counterfit Treatiſe only going under the name of *Luther*, though I am not ignorant that Mr. *Bell* who lately Tranſlated them into *Engliſh* would have them accounted genuine. At beſt, they were but extemporary diſcourſes, collected from his mouth at table, or ſuch like Teaſons, wherewith *Luther* himſelf is ſaid to have witneſſed much diſſatisfaction, and therefore ſuch ſtreſs ought not to be laid on them as upon written and deliberat tractats. Were the *Colloquia Menſalia* of Popes and Cardinals collected I believe we ſhould have much worſe ſtuff. What Language was that of the Pope, who ſaid he would have his cold Peacock, *al deſpeto de dio?* What an unſavory dialogue was that betwixt *Leo the tenth*, and Cardinal *Bembus*, wherein the Pope ſaid to the Cardinal, *quantum nobis profuit fabula de Chriſto?* As for *Luthers* judgment of the Fathers, I cannot expreſs it better then in the words of Dr. *Francis Whyte* canvaſing the ſame objection, *pag.* 261. concerning *Luther* (ſays he) even as in Sacred Scripture, the Prophet, *Iſai. cap.* 1. 11. and *cap.* 65. 3. And the Apoſtles having to do with hypocrits who placed Righteouſneſs in outward ceremonies, utter diverſe ſpeaches in diſgrace of legal rites, not depreſſing the ſame in themſelves, but ſhewing they were unprofitable to ſuch as abuſed them. So *Luther* being oppoſed by adverſaries, who preferred the Fathers before the Scriptures, correcting that abuſe, uſeth ſome broad ſpeeches (ſuch as our adverſary nameth) againſt the errors of ſome Fathers (not generally of all) but otherwiſe when Fathers are lawfully uſed, as witneſſes and interpreters of truth, he eſteemeth them, according to their worth, and yeelds as much to them as themſelves require, and to verify this, he cites two teſtimonies of *Luther*, which to ſtop the mouths of rayling adverſaries; I here thought fit to inſert. The firſt is, *periculoſum & horrendum eſt audire, vel credere, quod adverſatur unanimi teſtimonio fidei, & Doctrinæ Sanctæ Catholicæ eccleſiæ quam indejuſque ab initio unanimiter ſervavit.* So *Luther ad March. Brandeburg. tom.* 2. *germ. pag.* 243. again,

patres evangelium & fidem in Christum absq; ulla hypocrisi pure & simpliciter tradiderunt & ecclesiam ab innumeris erroribus expurgarunt, So the same *Luther Comment in cap.* 5. *ad Gal.* by this it may appear that *Luther* had a great honour for ancient Fathers, and believed that the ancient Church was a true Church of Christ.

Consider fourthly, the granting of Protestant Authors, that the Church was overspread with error, doth not conclude that they held the Church to have utterly perished. Every error in Religion destroys not the being of the Church. a maimed man is a man, though not a whole man; a leprous or paralitick man is a man, though not a sound man, so one erring Church, if the error be not in the essentials and fundamentals of Religion, is truly a Church of Christ, though not, *usq; quaque pura*, throughly pure and sound, yea in as much as the Church is said to be erroneous, her existence is supposed, doth not the inexistence of an accident in a subject suppose the existence of the Subject?

After that the worship of God was grosly corrupted by Idolatry in Israel, and Judah they remained visible Churches, and begat Sons and Daughters unto God, *Ezeck.* 16. 20. So Learned Protestants acknowledg that after the Roman Church was polluted with Idolatry and other absurd errors, yet she remained a visible Church though a very impure one, So *Calvin epist.* 103. 104. and *lib.* 4. *instit cap.* 2. *Sect.* 11. 12. *Zanch. in Epist. ad Comitem Barch.* and *lib. de relig. Christ. cap.* 24. *Sect.* 19. *Iun. lib. sing. de eccles. cap.* 17. *Mornæus de eccles. cap.* 2. *Sect. ecclesia Latina. cap.* 9. *Sect. Secundo, quemadmodum.* Dr. *Feild* in *append. ad lib.* 5. *part.* 3. *cap.* 2. where also he shews the same to be the judgment of *Luther*, *Bucer*, *Melanctiton*, and *Beza*. Neither is this for the advantage of the Popish interest, for most of these Authors acknowledg the Romish Church in these latter and corrupt times only so to be a visible Church, as the Apostle predicts the visible Church to be the seat of the Antichrist. When he says, 2 *Thes.* 2. 4. *that he shall sit in the Temple of God.* Yea all of them look upon Apostat Rome, as a Church so impure, that the reformed Churches did but their duty, and were not schismatical, in making secession from her; for she was the Author of the Schism, not only by adhering so pertinaciously to her corruptions; but also by

by impoſing on others the owning of them as grounds of communion with her, and by driving Proteſtants from her by Bulls and Excommunications, becauſe they could not own theſe corruptions; in ſo much that as King *James in reſp. ad Epiſt. Card. Perronij*, ſaith. *Non fugimus ſed fugamur.* However, by this it may appear that the prevailing of errors over the face of the viſible Church, doth not totally deſtroy the being of the viſible Church. Yea Jeſuit *Valentia in* 3. *part. diſp.* 1. *q.* 1. *punct.* 6 confeſſeth *quaſdam veritates fidei quandoq; ob hominum negligentiam vel proteruiam & ingenij perverſitatem demerſas latuiſſe & forſan adhuc latere*, that ſome Doctrins of Faith and not only probable opinions once delivered by the Apoſtles, thorow the ignorance or perverſneſs of men, were for a time drouned and lay as it were buried. until afterwards by the diligence and faithfulneſs of the Church they were revived, And perhaps ſaith he, ſome truths may be in that caſe at this very day. Hence to the clamorous cavil, where was our Religion before *Luther*, may ſolidly be replyed, It was, as to eſſentialls at leaſt, where ever God had a viſible Church, and conſequently not only in the *Greek*, *Syrian*, *Ægyptian*, and *Æthiopian* Churches, which remain viſible Churches, and more pure then the Roman, but alſo our Religion was preſerved in the Roman Church, ſhe likewiſe being a viſible Church, though a moſt impure one; I ſay our Religion was preſerved in her, as the true Religion was preſerved in the Jewiſh Church, when ſhe was defaced with groſs Idolatry. Neither ſhould this ſeem ſtrange eſpecially ſeeing many thouſands in the Roman Church then groaned for reformation, as appeared by the conjunction of ſo many with *Luther* upon his firſt appearance. I further add that we are not obliged to grant the ſame of the Roman Church at this time, which we grant of her before the reformation. For ſurely ſince the reformation, the Church of Rome is greatly changed to the worſe, as Dr. *Feild* in the place laſt cited, and *Voetius in deſper. cauſa papatus. lib.* 3. *Sect.* 3. *cap.* 3. have evicted by many Inſtances, and particularly, many things being now defined by her as Articles of Faith, which formerly were only debated as School-opinions. And yet perhaps notwithſtanding all theſe alterations to the worſe, ſhe may be in a large ſenſe allowed the name of a Church,

vere

vere ecclesia, though not *vera ecclesia*, as Learned men distinguish.

Consider fifthly, though the phrases of some Protestants concerning the prevailing of error in the Church, in these last times especially, may seem broad, yet Scripture, Fathers, yea and Romanists themselves speak as broadly in reference to times of Apostacy. And. 1. for Scripture, what expression would seem broader concerning the time of Antichrist then that, *Revel.* 13. 4. *That all the world wondred after the beast and worshipped the beast and the dragon*, what would seem wider then the World? *Revel.* 18. 3. *all Nations have drunk of the Wine, of the wrath of her fornication, and the Kings of the Earth committed fornication with her.* Did ever Protestants speake broader Language, concerning the apostacy under the Romish Antichrist then is there spoken by the Spirit of God. 2. as for Fathers, how lamentably do they bewaile the general overspreading of the Arrian heresy, *ingemuit orbis miratus se factum Arrianum*, said *Jerom. dial. adverf. Lucif.* Remarkable is the discourse in, *Theod. lib.* 2. *Hist. cap.* 16. betwixt *Constantius* the Arrian Emperor and *Liberius* Bishop of Rome, who then zealously owned the truth. *Quota pars es tu*, said the Emperor, *orbis terrarum, qui solus facis cum homine scelerato.* How small a part art thou of the whole World, that thou alone should joyn with that wicked man, so he designed the good *Athanasius.* To whom *Liberius* replyed *non diminuitur solitudine mea verbum fidei, Nam & tres solum inventi fuere qui edicto resisterent*, that is, the price of truth is not diminished by my solitude, for three only were found to resist *Nebuchadnezzars* impious edict. And *Austin Epist.* 80. *ad Hesych.* expresly *says* when the sun shall be darkned and the moon not give her light (all which he interprets allegorically) *Ecclesia non apparebit, impijs tunc persequutoribus ultra modum sævientibus.* The Church then shall not appear thorow the extream violence of wicked persecuters. Yea and thirdly Popish writers themselves confess that Antichrist shall take away the dayly Sacrifice, *& omne aliud publicum officium cultus divini*, So *Tirin* the Jesuit and before him, *Bell, lib.* 3. *de Pont. cap.* 7. If then Scripture, Fathers, Papists, use as broad expressions concerning the prevailing of error, why are the expressions of Protestants so Rated?

Consider

Conſider ſixthly, that though it be granted that there were errors in the Church, yet it doth not follow, *that the whole body of Popery, as now it is, was acknowledged to be always there, as this impudent* Pamphleter *would infer. Pag.* 136. *that all the Articles in Pope Pius confeſſion of Faith were owned by Councils and Fathers of the firſt three ages.* Yea, and he is bold to ſay, *that heerupon I am bound to turn Papiſt.* Let any man ſqueez his whole Book, and if he have evicted that noe Father or ancient Council, maintained the whole Syſteme of the preſent Romiſh Faith, I will be a Romaniſt? I cannot but have their Religion in greater abhorrency, when I ſee that they have no other way to ſupport it, but by manifeſt calumnies, and ſuch inconſequential diſcourſes. ſome Fathers erred in ſome things as is acknowledged both by Romaniſts and Proteſtants, therefore the whole preſent Romiſh Religion was owned by Councils and Fathers in the firſt three ages, a moſt ludibrious inconſequence. The miſtery of iniquity wrought but by degrees, the Papacy came never to its full ſubſiſtency till the Council of *Trent*, there be particulars there enacted as Articles of Faith which never were ſo before. Verily Popery is nothing but a complex of innovations brought in by peece meal. What is the ſcope of *Flaccus Illiricus*, his *Catalogus teſtium veritatis*, but to give an account of the witneſſes of truth in all ages ſince Chriſt, as any Popiſh error did creep in and appear in the Church? What is the ſcope of *Uſſer* his *tractat de ſucceſs Eccleſiarum in occidente*, but to ſhew the continuance of the Religion which Proteſtants profeſs in all ages, though Popiſh errors in progreſs of time were ſtill abroaching? What ſhould I ſpeak of *Morney's Myſterium iniquitatis. of Voetius his deſperata cauſa papatus*, of *Mortons appeal*, *Prideaux de viſibilitate Eccleſiæ*, *Moulin de novitate Papiſmi*, &c. All which and many more have made it their work to demonſtrate the perpetuity of that Religion which Proteſtants profeſs, notwithſtanding what ever corruptions in the Church, and have convicted the Romiſh Church of manifold innovations. And therefore in my tenth Paper againſt Mr. *Demſter*, I deſired him to ſhew me where the preſent Romiſh Religion was before the Council of *Trent*. But this the Phamphleter never touches, as if he were deaf upon that Eare. *He only brings ſome broken teſtimonies from this or that ancient, to give ſome plauſible colour ſometime to one, and ſometime*

time to another of their Popish tenets, and therein he often prevaricats also, but he never shews that the whole complex of their Religion, as now it stands, was before the Council of *Trent*, far less always.

From these six considerations, I suppose it may evidently appear, how sophistically this Pamphleter and others of his Fellows do misrepresent Protestants as to this matter, I shall shut up this discourse with two testimonies, one from learned Mr. *Hooker*, another from *Bellarmin*. The judgment of Protestants as to this case is excellently delivered by Mr. *Hooker*. *lib.* 3. *of Eccles. pol. pag.* 86. *Papists* (saith he) *aske us where our Religion did lurk before* Mr. *Luther*, *as if* (saith he) *we were of opinion that Luther did erect a new Church. Now the Church of Christ which was from the beginning continueth to the end, of which Church all parts have not been equally sincere and sound.* The other shall be of their own *Bellarmin. lib.* 3. *de Eccles. milit. cap.* 13. *Its to be noted*, saith he, *that many of ours do but loss time when they labour to prove that the Church cannot absolutely fail, for Calvin, and the rest of the Heretick*s (so he is pleased to design us) *do grant it.*

Page, 130. He has two reflexions upon my appeal to the Fathers of the first three Centuries, wherein he imagins he has discovered some acutness. But they are but spongious bulrushes and already confuted, yet I shall mention them. 1. *he enquires why I appeal to the Faith of the Church in the first three ages more then in after times? Was her Doctrin then purer, her condition more Flourishing, or her Authority then greater?* He may find the same objection answered in my *Paper.* 7. *against* Mr. *Dempster from pag.* 130. *to* 135. *and paper* 10*th. pag.* 215. 216. It seems this man is not acquainted with the writings of the more Learned Jesuits, for *Greg. de Val. in* 3. *part. disp.* 1. *q.* 1. *punct.* 6. disputes this question at length. Whither they who lived next to the Apostles did not *eo plenius divina mysteria nosse*, understand more fully Divine Mysteries then others of after-times, and concludes the affimative tracing the foot steps of *Aquinas* their Angelike Doctor. Now therefore only in a word I say that though the Churches Authority was not then greater, nor her condition, as to outward prosperity so flourishing, yet then her Doctrin was more pure and she flourished more in Holiness, then had she *aureos Sacerdotes*, though, *ligneos calices.*

Is

Is it any wonder that a ſtream run purer, the nearer to the Fountain? When hath the truth of Doctrin, the beauty of holineſs, ſhined more, then when the Church has been labouring in the Furnace of fiery preſecution? Told I not expreſly, *paper* 10. *pag.* 216. that I never intended to reſtrict this enquiry to thoſe ages alone, only pleading to begin at them, but this, Romaniſts would willingly decline. All their ſeeming advantages are from the more corrupt times of the Church. They aske, where our Church was before *Luther*, which has been often ſufficiently cleared. But we aske at them, where their Religion was in the firſt three ages, and much lower alſo, which never was, yea never will be ſufficiently cleared. Take their Religion, as it is ſet forth by *Pius quartus* confeſſion of Faith, and in the Council of *Trent*, and let all the Jeſuits upon the face of the earth, find it out in the firſt three ages of Chriſtianity, if they can. How far the broken fragments, which this Pamphleter filches from his Fellows, are from performing this work, ſhall (I hope) be ſeen in *Cap.* 7.

The ſecond reflexion is, *If I appeal to the Faith of the Church of the firſt three ages then I muſt acknowledge one infallible viſible Judge.*

Anſwer, I deny the ſequel, was it to any repreſentative of the firſt three ages which I did appeal? Is it not acknowledged that in the firſt three ages from that Council at *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 15. there was no general Council which together with a Pope is made by this Pamphleter the infallible Judge? Was it not to the Faith of the diffuſive Catholike Church, to which I did appeal, to which neither Papiſt nor Proteſtant aſcribes a juridical power? But the diffuſive Church has a promiſe of perpetuity, and Conſequently that the eſſentialls of Faith ſhall be preſerved in her. If therefore the Faith of the ancient Catholike Church may be known, by it the Faith of the preſent Church may be tryed. Yet I ever made it but a ſecundary rule, the holy Scriptures being the chief teſt, but of this I treated more at large, *Paper* 7. *Pag.* 231, 232. 233. 234.

Page, 136. he ſays, *that I affirm that papiſts agree with us in all our poſitive tenets*; it ſeems Romiſh miſſionaries are ſo habituated in lying that they can hardly ſpeak truth, I never either

ſpoke or thought ſo. Papiſts are injurious to the truth not only by addition, but alſo by ſubſtraction. Do they not ſubſtract the cup in the Sacrament, Do they not ſubſtract the ſubſtance both of Bread and Wine, leaving only a ſpecter of accidents to remain in the Sacramental Symbols? Do they not deny the perſpicuity of Scriptures, and that all ſins of their own nature merit eternal damnation, *&c.* in all which they hold the negative, and we the affirmative. *The obſerve which* he ſubjoyns *that all cheif Hereſies for moſt part conſiſted in negatives.* Is ludibrious? all, for the moſt part, is all, and not all. But have not groſs Hereticks maintained poſitive errors as *Manichees duo principia*, *Tritheits* three Gods, the *Neſtorians* two perſons in Chriſt. *John* of *Conſtantinople* that himſelf was univerſal Biſhop, *&c.* Is he not ſo ridiculous in reckoning the negatives of Hereticks that as would ſeem he could not diſtinguiſh betwixt an affirmative and a negative? Among negative Hereticks he reckons the *Neſtorians*, whoſe Hereſy conſiſted in a poſitive aſcribing two perſons to Chriſt, and the *Marcionits* for maintaining that Baptiſm ſhould be reiterated. Is not rebaptization a poſitive? Papiſts maintain ſeven Sacraments, ſhould others maintain twice ſeven, were they not Heretical? Papiſts add Apocrypha Books to the Old Teſtament. If others added the evangells of *Thomas* and *Nicodemus* to the New Teſtament were they not Hereticks, Papiſts ſay *dulia* ſhould be given to Saints, ſhould others aſſert the lawfullneſs of *Latria* to them, were they not Hereticks. There may therefore be Hereſy in poſitives, But what though all Hereticks maintained negatives, which yet is falſe, doth it therefore follow that all who maintain negatives are Hereticks? Is a Syllogiſm in *2da figura ex omnibus affirmantibus* good? Though it were ſo, the Papiſts could not clear themſelves from Hereſy, for they alſo differ from us in negatives, This only in paſſing to ſhew the ludibrious quibling of Sophiſticating Jeſuits.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The Truth of the Religion of Proteſtants evicted, by the Conformity thereof with the faith of the Primitive Church, in the firſt three Ages, and the falſhood of the preſent Romiſh Religion from the diſagreement thereof with the Faith of theſe Ages.

THere being but one Faith, *Epheſ.* 4. 5. or one true Chriſtian Religion, which undoubtedly was conſerved, in as great purity by the Church, in the firſt three Ages, as in any other time, conſequently among the many pretenders to Religion in theſe days, their Religion muſt only be true which agreeth in eſſentials with the Faith of the Catholick Church in thoſe Ages, and that ſurely muſt be a falſe Religion, which is diſcrepant in Eſſentials from that primitive Faith. Whereupon I ſubſume, but ſo it is, that the Religion of Proteſtants doth agree in Eſſentials with the Faith of the Catholick Church in thoſe times, and the preſent Romiſh Religion doth certainly diſagree. Therefore the Religion of Proteſtants is the true Chriſtian Religion, and the Popiſh Religion is falſe and impious. The evidence of the firſt propoſition is ſo clear, that the Pamphleter in a peculiar Section from *pag.* 139. labours to juſtifie the preſent Romiſh Faith by ſome abuſive Pretexts of Antiquity, as if the Fathers of thoſe Ages did clearly ſpeak for them, and againſt Proteſtants in all the chief controverted points. It remains therefore, that I prove the Aſſumption. In order to which, I only premiſe, that a Religion may differ from that ancient Faith in Eſſentials, or in points neceſſary to Salvation, two ways, *viz.* Either by denying ſome Articles of faith, which ſhe held as neceſſary, or by coyning others as neceſſary, which ſhe held not. This premiſed,

For evicting the conformity of our Religion, as to all Eſſentials, with the Faith of the Catholick Church in the firſt ages, it

be ſufficient to renew to all Romaniſts my appeal made to Mr. *Dempſter*, *pag.* 4. *pag.* 54. to inſtance one Eſſential of Faith, wherein we differ from the Chriſtian Church in thoſe Ages, that is, to pitch upon one Article held as abſolutely neceſſary by the Catholick Church of thoſe times, and denied by the Reformed Churches, or one Article, which the Reformed Churches hold as abſolutely neceſſary, and thoſe ancient Churches held not. If we may judge of what other Romaniſts can ſay, as to this matter, by the ten Inſtances which the Pamphleter from *pag.* 139. has ſcraped together from their common Place Books. I hope the enſuing examination of them ſhall diſcover more the conſonancy of our Religion with the ancient Chriſtian Religion, and the diſſonancy of the Romiſh Religion. Or if we meaſure the Eſſentials of the ancient Chriſtian Faith, by the ancient Creeds and Confeſſion of Faith, theſe being drawn up as teſts to diſtinguiſh them of the Church from others, which, as is ſuppoſed by learned Divines, would not anſwer their end, if they did not contain the Articles, which the Church in thoſe days held as neceſſary. Then ſurely the Proteſtant Churches do agree with the ancient Church in all Eſſentials of Faith. For all the Reformed Churches do cordially own all the ancient Creeds, and Confeſſions of the Primitive Churches, not only in the firſt three ages, but alſo much lower, ſuch as the Apoſtolick, the *Antiochian*, *Nicen*, *Conſtantinopolitan*, *Athanaſian*, as alſo theſe of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, neither have the Proteſtant Churches made a ſuper-addition of new eſſential Articles unknown to the Primitive Church in thoſe times. Nay, ſo clear are Reformed Churches in this matter, that we appeal all the Enemies of the Reformed Religion, to try our conformity to the ancient Chriſtian Church in all Eſſentials with the moſt rigid diſcuſs that is imaginable.

But on the other hand, the diſconformity of the preſent Romiſh Faith, with that ancient Catholick Faith, may be obvious to any, by comparing thoſe ancient Creeds with the preſent Popiſh Creed of Pope *Pius* the Fourth, in which a multitude of Articles are ſuper-added, ſuch as the Septenary number of Sacraments, the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Maſs, Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory, Innovation of Saints, Adoration of Images and Reliques, the power of Indulgences, the Magiſterial Supremacy of the Church and Pope of *Rome* over the whole Catholick

tholick Church, yea, and all the Articles of the Council of *Trent* are concluded as neceſſary to Salvation. Which certainly are not to be found in any of the ancient Creeds; Nay the Roman Creed ſubjoyns theſe to the Conſtantinopolitan Creed, as ſuperadded thereto, as is to be ſeen *in vitâ Pij 4ti* ſet forth by *Onuphrius*, and in the Confeſſion annexed to, *H. T.* his Manual, as a teſt of the Romiſh Religion, therefore the preſent Romiſh Religion is not the true ancient Chriſtian Religion, but a bundle of innovations tyrannically impoſed upon Conſciences of People.

Yet becauſe this impoſtor pitches upon *ten Articles* controverted betwixt us and Romaniſts, wherein he affirms, *that the Fathers of the firſt three ages ſpeake clearly againſt Proteſtants*, it may contribute both for the further clearing of the truth, and diſcovering of Roman perfidy, to trace him throw theſe particulars.

SECT. I.

The Pamphleters firſt Inſtance of Novelty, touching the Popes *Supremacy, briefly canvaſed, and retorted upon Romaniſts.*

HIs firſt inſtance, *Pag.* 139. is concerning *the Popes Supremacy, as being*, ſays he, *the moſt principal thing.* Its indeed the moſt principal thing with the Popes Paraſits, hence, *Bell. lib. 2. de concil. cap.* 17. *Greg. de Val. lib.* 8. *de anal. fid. cap.* 7. and other Jeſuits give the Pope a ſupremacy over the whole Catholick Church, yea and over general Councils, as Pope *Boniface the* 8. *extrav. commun. unam Sanctam*, had defined *that ſubjection to the Pope, is of neceſſity to Salvation to every Creature.* But this is as oppoſit to the faith of the ancient Church as Eaſt to Weſt. Had this been the faith of the Church in thoſe times, then it had been defined, according to the Pamphleters Principle, by the infallible viſible judge of thoſe times. Why then does he not produce ſuch a definition among his citations? Doth not the world know that in thoſe three ages there was not one Oecumenick Council, except that at *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 15. unleſs with *Binius* and the Ordinary gloſs thoſe other three Conventions of the Apoſtles, *Act. cap.* 1. 6. 21. be alſo held for Oecumenick Councils. But ſure it is, that

that none of all theſe made any definition for the Popes ſupremacy, Conſequently there was no infallible viſible judge in thoſe times to make ſuch a definition. I did always apprehend that the ſeat of the pretended Romiſh infallibility had been the ſeat of their ſupremacy. How then is it, that though Pope and Council were inſinuated by this *Pamphleter Sect.* 3. to be the ſeat of infallibility joyntly. Yet now the Pope alone is made the ſeat of ſupremacy? Is he alone ſupream but not infallible? Is their Church bound to obey and believe a fallible Pope teaching lyes and blaſphemies, as having ſupremacy over them, though not infallibility? Had the Churches in thoſe three ages believed the Popes ſupremacy as neceſſary to Salvation, would *Polycrates* and the holy Aſiatick Fathers in the ſecond Century, have withſtood the Pope ſo reſolutly in the matter of Eaſter, as is witneſſed by, *Euſeb. lib.* 5. *cap.* 22? Would *Cyprian* ſo holy a Father, and Martyr with the Affrican Fathers in the third *Century* ſo vehemently have oppoſed Pope *Stephanus* in the matter of rebaptization, as is acknowledged by *Bell. lib.* 4. *de Pontif. cap.* 7? Would he have ſo zealouſly oppoſed appeals, to Rome as he does, *Epiſt.* 55. or cenſured Popes ſo ſharply for admitting them, which is to ſtrike at the root of this pretended ſupremacy? Would the *fourth Oecumenick Council at Chalcedon, Act.* 15. *can.* 28. and *Act.* 16. in which were 630. Fathers have defined in *foro contradictorio*, after debate with the legats of Rome, that the Biſhop of Conſtantinople ſhould have equal priviledges with the Biſhop of Rome? Would the ſecond Council of *Milevit. can.* 22. have ordained them to be excommunicated, who ſhould make tranſmarin appeals? Would the ſame African Fathers, among whom *Auſtin* was one, in the ſixth Council of Carthage, have ſo ſtoutly oppoſed appeals to Rome, as *Baron. ad annum.* 419. cannot deny, though both he and *Bell. lib.* 2. *de Pontif. cap.* 25. endeavour by ſome ſlight evaſions to palliat the matter, the falſhood whereof is luculently evicted by *Chamier. Panſtrat. tom.* 2. *lib.* 14. *cap.* 3. 4. yea the caſe is ſo clear, that *Stapleton relect. princip. controv.* 3. *queſt.* 7. Is not aſhamed to condemn the proceedings of that ancient African Council againſt the Popes of *Rome*. Such is the reſpect of Romaniſts to Antiquity, when it croſſes their intereſt. Had the Popes ſupremacy been an eſſential of the Chriſtian Faith? Would

Would *Greg.* 600. Yeares after Chriſt. *lib.* 4. *Epiſt.* 32. 34. 38. 39. have condemned the Title of univerſal Biſhop, as a Title of Novelty, error, blaſphemy, the univerſal poyſon of the Church, contrary to the Ancient Canons, contrary to *Peter*, and to God himſelf, a Title which none of his predeceſſors aſſumed, and who ever did preſume to challenge it, was a forrunner of the Antichriſt. Its a manifeſt forgery contrary to all truth, which, *Bellarmin. lib.* 2. *de Pontif. cap.* 31. and other Romaniſts uſe to elude thoſe luculent teſtimonies of *Greg.* as if he had only condemned the title of univerſal Biſhop in that ſenſe wherein *John* of *Conſtantinople* did claim it, *Namely*, ſo as he alone ſhould be Biſhop, and other Biſhops ſhould not at all be Biſhops, but his Vicars. Whereas *John* of *Conſtantinople* never claimed that Title in any other ſenſe, then it is this day uſed by the Biſhops of Rome, for. 1. the oriental Biſhops conſented with *John* of *Conſtantinople* that he ſhould be termed univerſal Biſhop, but its hardly credible, that they would all have conſented that themſelves ſhould be degraded. But ſecondly Romiſh Authors, particularlarly *Platina* in the Life of *Boniface* the third doth teſtify, that the ſame dignity which *John* did effect, *Boniface* obtained from that bloody Murtherer *Phocas*, not without much ado, *magna tamen contentione*, ſays *Platina*. Doth not the oppoſition which the Ancient Brittiſh and *Scottiſh* Churches made to *Auſtin* the Monk, to *Laurentius* and *Mellitus*, ſent over to *England* by *Greg.* the firſt in the matter of Eaſter and celebration of Baptiſm, of which ſee, *Bede. Hiſt. lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. and 4. and *Barronius ad annum.* 604. demonſtrat that the Popes ſupremacy was not an eſſential Article of their Faith, Yea ſo far was it from being an Article of the Faith of the Ancient Catholick Church, that in late Councils ſuch as that of *Conſtance. ſeſs.* 4. & 5. and of *Baſil. ſeſs.* 2. Its ſtatuted that Popes be ſubject to the decrees of general Councils, and *ſeſs.* 39. who ever contradict this, is ſtigmatized as an Heretick. Behold then the ſtupendious impudency of thoſe men. Though many ſuch luculent demonſtrations of the contrariety betwixt the now Romiſh Faith, and the Ancient Catholick Faith, in this *their principal point of the Popes ſupremacy*, have been often propoſed yet they have confidence ſtill to alleadge that the Church in the three firſt, yea in all ages was of the ſame Faith with them. They might as well ſay that within thoſe

firſt

firſt three ages, *Ignatius Loyola* founded the order of Jeſuits which all know to be but of Yeſterdays erection.

But hath he not ſome pretences for his aſſertion? Yes, but thoſe, which times without number have been confuted. The chief of his citations are manifeſtly ſpurious, ſuch as that from *Denys de divinis nominibus, cap.* 3. *Clement. epiſt.* 1. *and the decretals of Pope Zepherinus.* The decretals of *Clement, Zepherinus*, and of many more Biſhops of *Rome* are not only demonſtrated to be Spurious by *Whittaker, Cocus*, and *Blondel*, but alſo are acknowledged to be ſuch by learned Romaniſts, *Turrecremata, Poſſevin, Barronius*, as is obſerved by *Rivet, Crit. Sac. l.* 1. *c.* 8. particular reaſons may be ſeen in *Cocus*, againſt each of them, *Bellarmin* himſelf *de Script. Eccleſ. Pag.* 51. *edit pariſ.* 1630. queſtions the epiſtles, which now paſs under the name of *Clement.* As for the Books attributed to *Denys*, learned and modeſt *Cauſabon. exercit. in Baron.* 16. *Sect.* 43. affirms none can look on them as the writings of the *Areopagit*, but he that is groſly ignorant and a ſtranger to antiquity. *Rivet. lib. cit. cap.* 9. brings 13: arguments to prove them Spurious, and that they wer not ſo much as writen within the firſt three ages. It's noted by *Cocus, in Cenſur. Vet. Script. Pag.* 50. 51. not only that *Valla, Eraſmus, Grocinus*, and *Photius* hold theſe writings to be Suppoſititious, but that alſo they are queſtioned by *Cajetan*, yea and as ſeems likewiſe by *Bell. lib.* 2. *de confirm. cap.* 7. and the like is noted by *Strang. lib.* 2. *de Script. cap.* 21. concerning *Ribera* the Ieſuit. But grant they wer genuin, yet in *lib. de devinis nom. cap.* 3. there is nothing for the *Pope of Romes* Supremacy, yea not ſo much as mention of *Rome* or of the Pope thereof, only of the Apoſtle *Peter*, it's ſaid that he is, ὁ κορυφαῖος καὶ πρωτοτυπὴς τῶν θεολόγων ἀκροτὴς, which only imports the primaty of order which *Peter* had among the Apoſtles, but no juriſdiction over them, and though he had it, what is that to the Pope of *Rome*, unleſs it could be proved, that the Pope ſucceeded to *Peter* in the latitude of his Apoſtolicall function, which will be found an hard taske.

Concerning *Ignatius, whoſe Epiſtle to the Romans the Pamphletter cites, I will* not remit him to *Rob. Parker, de Polit. Eccleſ. lib.* 2. *cap.* 13. who alſo muſters up a Multitude of arguments to prove theſe epiſtles attributed to *Ignatius* to be Spurious. Nor will I altogether condemn as Suppoſititious the Seven Epiſtles mentioned as his by *Euſeb. and Hierom.* yet *Revet in crit. Sac. lib.* 2. *cap* 1. *et* 2. following learned *Uſher* makes it very probable that they

are

are interpolated and vitiated, yea *Bell.* himſelf. *lib.* 4. *de Euchariſt. cap.* 26. confeſſes, that there be many errors crept into them. How can a firm argument be taken from vitiated Epiſtles? But grant them to be entire (and the rather ſeeing I find reformed Criticks divided, eſpecially concerning the Latin Edition of *Ignatius*, ſet forth by *Biſhop Uſher*, and the Greek publiſhed by *Iſaac Voſſius*) yet all this Pamphleter can alleadge from *Ignatus*, is only a tranſient word in the inſcription of the Epiſtle to the Romans, which alſo he miſrepreſents, though I blame not him ſo much as them from whom he borrowed the citation.

The words in the Greek concerning the Church of *Rome* are, ἥτις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων, which if rendered paſſively, *quæ præſidetur* (which is preſided over, or which is governed by her own paſtours) give no ſhadow of a Countenance to Romiſh ſupremacy, but take them actively (which preſides) yet the preſidency of that Church is reſtricted to the Religion of the Romans, ſo that no univerſal juriſdiction is there aſcribed to her.

The Teſtimonies of *Ireneus Cyprian*, and *Origen.* are ſufficiently vindicated by Learned *Chamier*, *Whittaker*, Dr. *Morton*, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, &c. to whom it were enough for me to remit him. He had done well to have left out *Ireneus*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. for he is there diſputing againſt unwritten Traditions maintained by the *Valentinian Heretick*, and confutes them by this argument, becauſe if there were ſuch Traditions left, the Churches founded by the Apoſtles could not be ignorant of them. And becauſe it had been long to have recited all, he mentions the Church of *Rome*, to which the faithful reſorted from all places, ſhe being ſeated in the imperial City, which is that he meant, by the more powerful principality, that reſort to her from all quarters, was not from the juriſdiction of the Church of *Rome*, but from peoples neceſſary affaires in the imperial City, as is largly cleared by *Chamier*, *tom.* 2. *lib.* 13. *cap.* 22. and *Stillingfleet. Part.* 2. *cap.* 6. *Sect.* 12. 13. Yea, *Ireneus* is ſo far from acknowledging the Popes ſupremacy, that he reprehended *Victor* for his carriage to *Polycrates*, and the *Aſiaticks*, and as ſeems retained communion with them notwithſtanding the Popes Excommunication, as may be gathered from, *Euſeb. lib.* 5. *Hiſt. cap.* 23.

I proceed to *Cyprian* whom the Pamphleter cites, *Epiſt. ad Jul.* calling Peter *the head and root of the Church, and Epiſt.* 55. *the Church of Rome* Peters *Chair.* But there is none who withſtood Popes of *Rome* more reſolutely then *Cyprian.* Notice but that one Character which in *Epiſt.* 74. *ad Pompeium* he gives to *Stephanus* Biſhop of *Rome, viz.* that he defends the cauſe of Hereticks againſt Chriſtians, and the Church of Chriſt; Sure therefore *Cyprian* neither acknowledged the ſupremacy nor the infallibility of the *Pope.* It may be time enough to anſwer the firſt of thoſe citations, when he finds out *Cyprians Epiſt. ad Jul.* for I cannot find ſuch an Epiſtle among all *Cyprians* Works. But poor Soul he could ſay no better then his *Manual* of controverſies, for *H. T. Art.* 7. cites it thus, *Epiſt. ad Julian* I find indeed *Cyprian Epiſt* 45. *ad Cornel.* exhorting them who ſayled from *Africk* to *Rome* (in the time that *Novatianus* was ſchiſmatically choſen Biſhop of *Rome*) to adhere to the root and Matrix of the Catholick Church, not that he ſo called the Roman Church, but as *Chamier* judiciouſly obſerves, *tom.* 2. *de Oecum. Pontif. lib.* 13. *cap.* 23. the Catholick Church adviſing them not to joyn with any ſchiſmatical party, but to adhere to thoſe who did keep the unity of the Catholick Church. The ſame is the importance of that which *Cyprian* ſays *Epiſt.* 73. *ad Jubajanum* (which perhaps this Pamphleter in his Collection from others has taken for *Epiſt. ad Jul. Nos unius Eccleſiæ caput & radicem tenemus.* We keep the head and the root of the only Church, but there he makes no mention of *Peter* at all. So that the meaning is, we keep the unity of the Catholick Church, whereof particular Churches are members and branches. What though the Church of *Rome* be termed the Chair of *Peter*? Is it not uſual with Fathers to mention the Chairs of other Apoſtles, as may be ſeen in *Tertul. de præſcript. cap.* 36 or had *Peter* himſelf juriſdiction over the reſt of the Apoſtles? No verily, Yea the Apoſtolick function being ſupream, if the reſt had been ſubordinate to *Peter*, they had been ſupream as being Apoſtles, and not ſupream as being ſubordinate to *Peter.* Hence *Cyprian de unit. eccleſ.* ſays, *hoc erant utique cæteri Apoſtoli quod erat Petrus, pari conſortio præditi honoris & poteſtatis.* That which he cites out of *Origen on the cap.* 6. ad

ad Rom. (beſides that *Jerome* in his time took notice that thoſe Books of *Origen* on the Romans were interpolated) imports nothing but *Peters* Apoſtolical function, which was common to him with the reſt of the Apoſtles, and ſo makes nothing for the pretended Supremacy of the Pope of *Rome*.

Laſtly, the Pamphleter ſaith, *that Polanus, and Whittaker, confeſs that Victor did carry himſelf like a Pope.* Anſwer, Its long ſince to this allegiance of *Breerly*, from whom the Pamphleter filches it, Dr. *Morton* replyed in his appeal, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 22. *Sect.*2. that indeed they cenſured *Victor* for his arrogancy, and as a troubler of Chriſtendom. For which alſo he was reprehended by Ancient Fathers of that age, and theſe are but too ordinary endowments of Popes. But no Proteſtant did charge *Victor*, for aſſuming an abſolute power over Oecumenick Councils, or infallibility of Judgment to himſelf, as Popes do at this day. So that however he reſembled them in ſome ſinful practiſes, yet differed from them in Faith. Neither did his Excommunicating of ſome eaſtern Biſhops imply his aſſuming a juriſdiction over them, as is judiciouſly demonſtrated both by Dr. *Morton. ibid.* and ſince by Dr. *Stilling fleet. Part.* 2. *cap.* 6. *Sect.* 11. for ſome Biſhops in the eaſt did Excommunicate Pope *Julius*, as teſtifies *Sozom. lib.* 3. *cap.* 11. and *Menas* the patriarch of *Conſtantinople* did excommunicate Pope *Vigilius* as witneſſes, *Nicepb. Hiſt. lib.* 17. *cap.* 26. and *Photius*, *Anno* 863. did Excommunicate Pope *Nicolas* the firſt, by the confeſſion of *Barronius*, therefore their Excommunication did only import they were not to admit ſuch to their communion. I ſhall ſhut up this diſcourſe of ſupremacy with that teſtimony of *Cyprian* and of 87. *Biſhops in Concil. Carthag. de baptizandis haret. Non of us*, ſay they, *is called Biſhop of Biſhops*, and furthermore they call it a Tyrannical terrour for any one Biſhop to impoſe upon his fellow Biſhops a neceſſity of obedience. May not I therefore conclude this firſt inſtance of Novelty with a retorſion.

The Popes ſupremacy was no eſſential of the Chriſtian Faith, in the firſt three *Centuries*, But the Popes ſupremacy is an eſſential of the preſent Romiſh Religion, *Ergo* there is an eſſential in the preſent Romiſh Religion, which was not in the Chriſtian Religion of the firſt three *Centuries*, *quod erat demonſtrandum.*

SECT. II.

The ſecond inſtance of Novelty; concerning unwritten Traditions, examined and retorted upon Romaniſts.

THe Pamphleters ſecond Inſtance is concerning unwritten Traditions, *Proteſtants*, ſaith he, *deny that we ſhould believe any thing, not contained in Scripture, upon Apoſtolical Tradition conſerved in the Church*, where fallaciouſly he inſinuats, 1. that Proteſtants deny credit to Traditions really Apoſtolical. 2. that in the Roman Church are conſerved Traditions truly Apoſtolical of Articles of Faith, not contained in Scripture, Both which are Splendidly falſe; we do indeed maintain againſt Romaniſts a compleat ſufficiency of the holy Scriptures as containing all Articles of Faith, and herein we have the unanimous conſent of the Ancient Church. Doth not *Irenæus lib. 3. cap. 2.* call the Goſpel the pillar and ground of Faith. Does he not. *ibid.* reprove Hereticks, for accuſing Scriptures, as if the truth could not be found by them, who are ignorant of Tradition. Is not *Tertullian* luculent for us, *lib. contra Hermog. cap. 22. adoro ſcripturarum plenitudinem*, and thereupon pronounced a woe upon them that teach any point of Faith not juſtifiable by the Scriptures. Saith not *Origen hom. 1. in Jerem, Neceſſe eſt Scripturas ſanctas in teſtimonium vocare, ſenſus. quippe noſtri ſine his teſtibus non habent fidem.* Is not *Cyprian* as expreſs, *Epiſt. 74. ad Pompeium, unde iſta traditio, an ex dominica Authoritate veniens, an de Apoſtolorum mandatis, atq; Epiſtolis veniens, ea enim facienda quæ ſcripta ſunt teſtatur Deus.* Hence that Religious Emperour *Conſtantine in Theod. lib. 1. cap. 7.* adviſed the *Nicen* Fathers that they ſhould conſult with the divinely inſpired Scriptures, becauſe they do fully inſtruct us what to believe in divine things. Did not *Bell.* bewray his deſperate cauſe, when *lib. 1. de verb. Dei. cap. 11.* he anſwered that *Conſtantin* was indeed a great Emperour but no great Doctor. Is not this to condemn the judgment of the *Nicen* Fathers, who did approve the Emperors advice. It were eaſie to confirm the ſame truth from *Athanaſius, Chryſoſt. Baſil, Epiph. Hierom, Auſtin*, let it be judged in the fear of God, whither our Religion

Religion be the ſafer, which acknowledges the Holy Scripture as a compleat Canon adequately commenſurated to the end for which it was appointed, or Popery which (as Dr. *Morton* fitly uſeth the reſemblance in his appeal, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 25.) makes Gods word like a ſick mans broken and imperfect will, half nuncupative and half written.

As for the Pamphleters citations, he might have known what is anſwered to them by our controverſiſts in their replies to, *Bell.* they all being taken from him. And 1. *to Denys, de Eccleſ. Hierarch. cap.* 1. Its anſwered that not only is the Book ſpurious, but alſo he only affirms that the Apoſtles did deliver the Doctrin of Salvation two ways, *viz.* by word and by writ, which none denies. But the preſent queſtion is whither all that's neceſſary be not contained in the written word. To *that of Ignatius apud Euſeb. lib.* 3. *cap.* 4. I anſwer, he indeed exhorts all to ſtick to the Traditions of Apoſtles, but they are ſtrangers in Antiquity who know not that by Traditions, Ancients do alſo underſtand the Doctrin of Faith recorded in the holy Scriptures, ſee *Cyprian Epiſt.* 74. *ad Pomp.* and *Baſil, lib.* 3. *contra Eunom.* Neither is there a veſtige in the place objected to ſignify that it is a Doctrin not contained in Scripture. To *that from Irenæus. lib.* 3. *cap.* 4. He ſpeaks I confeſs of barbarous nations who believed in Chriſt *ſine charactere & atramento*, But he does not ſay that they believed Articles of Faith not contained in the Scripture, nay, all the Articles which there he reckons out are Scripture Truths. Nor do we deny, if a Preacher not having a Bible with him, ſhould come to ſome *American* Countrys and Preach the Goſpel, that they were bound to believe, yet it would not follow that the truths which they believed were not contained in Scripture. To *Origen Hom.* 5. *in Num. and in cap.* 6. *ad Rom.* Its anſwered ſome of the Traditions mentioned by *Origen*, are written Traditions, ſuch as that in *Rom. cap.* 6. of the baptiſm of infants which *Bell.* himſelf proves by Scripture, others of them as concerning peoples poſture in prayer are only ritual, and ſo do not touch the preſent queſtion which is of Articles of Faith. To *Tertullian its anſwered*, that after he turned *Montaniſt*, he did ſpeak too much for Traditions, yea, and for Traditions which Romaniſts themſelves reject, ſuch as a threefold immerſion, giving honey and milk to perſons babtized, *&c.* Either there-

ſore

ſore Romaniſts muſt Montanize and condemn themſelves for rejecting many Traditions approve by *Tertullian*, or lay aſide his Teſtimonies, *His Book de coron. militis*, is ſuppoſed by ſome Learned men to be written in his Montaniſm, yea, and by *Pamelius* himſelf; *in vitâ Tertull.* yet moſt of the Traditions mentioned there, are about rituals and diſciplinary matters, But in his writtings againſt Hereticks, ſuch as that againſt *Hermogenes* and his preſcriptions he is full for us; It had been therefore the Pamphleters prudence not to have touched his Book *de præſcriptionibus*, for there expreſly he condemns Hereticks for maintaining Traditions which were alleadged to be communicated in a clanculary way by the Apoſtles, only to ſome few. And whereas he ſaid, Hereticks were to be convicted by Tradition, he ſpeaks not of Traditions altogether unwritten, but of Scriptural Doctrins, which had been tranſmitted, done in the Apoſtolick Churches to that time. And it is in oppoſition to Hereticks who either did deny the Scriptures, or mutilate them, or acknowledged not their perfection. Though againſt ſuch Traditions be improven, It follows not that all Articles of Faith are not contained in Scripture. And beſides it was eaſier then to diſpute from Tradition being ſo near to the Apoſtolick age, then now after ſo many reelings and viciſſitudes. To *Cyprian who lib.* 1. *Epiſt.* 12. *ſays that the Babtized ought to be anoynted, and lib.* 2. *Epiſt.* 3. *that water ſhould be mixed with wine in the Euchariſt.* Its anſwered that theſe are only rituals, no Articles of Faith, yea the *Trent* Catechiſm *de Baptiſmo Act.* 7. defins that water is the only matter of Baptiſm, and conſequently Baptiſm may be without unction. So certainly it was in the Baptiſm of the *Eunuch. Act.* 8. 38, 39. of *Cornelius. Act.* 10. 47, 48. and of the *Jaylour. Act.* 16. 33. The ſame Roman Catechiſm *de Euch. Act.* 10. defins bread and wine to be the only matter of the Euchariſt and expreſly, *Act.* 17. *& ſi aqua deſit, ſacramentum Euchariſtiæ conſtare poſſet.* But all our queſtion is of Articles of Faith.

There remains nothing as to the matter of Tradition, but that he charges *the Fathers as receiving the Scripture only upon Tradition*, Yet for this he alleadges no proof, and therefore it may be rejected as a Jeſuitiſm. Did not the Fathers ſee as clear evidence for the Divine Authority of Scriptures as Jeſuits? Yet both *Valentia lib.* 1. *de anal. fidei. per totum*, and *Bell. de verb. Dei.*

Dei. lib. 1. *cap.* 2. do produce many arguments beſide Tradition for the Divine Original of Scripture. And which is more, not only Fathers did acknowledge the ſelf evidencing Light of Holy Scripture, as *Origen* περὶ ἀρχῶν, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 1. but alſo Romaniſts themſelves in their lucid intervalls, as *Val. lib. cit. cap.* 20. and *Melchior Camus. lib.* 2. *cap.* 8. and Dr. *Strang deſcript. lib.* 1. *cap.* 17. *Pag.* 128. brings in *Mantuan* ſpeaking moſt expreſly to this purpoſe. We are, perſwaded, ſaith he, that Scripture flowed from the firſt truth, *ſed unde ſumus ita perſuaſi, niſi a ſeipſa.* But beſides this, Romaniſts muſt be remembred, that the Traditions atteſting the Scriptures to be the word of God, is not to be reckoned among unwritten Traditions, the ſame being written, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. There be alſo many Learned Divines who defer very much to that Tradition, in the reſolution of the belief of the Scripturs, who yet hold the Scriptures to be the compleat rule of Faith, and that all the Articles, or material objects of our Faith are contained in Scripture. What need I more againſt the neceſſity of unwritten Traditions in the preſent Romiſh ſenſe? Seeing *Austin, lib.* 3. *contra Lit. Petilian. cap.* 6. Pronounces an Anathema upon all them who ſhall teach any thing either of Chriſt or his Church, or any matter of Faith, beſide that which is received from legal and evangelical Scriptures, hence another demonſtration of the falſhood and Novelty of the Romiſh Religion.

That unwritten Traditions of Articles of Faith, are to be received with equal devotion, as the Scriptures of God, was no eſſential of the Faith of the Catholick Church in the firſt three ages. But this is an eſſential of the preſent Romiſh Faith, *Ergo*, &c.

SECT. III.

The third inſtance of Novelty, concerning the Sacrifice of the Maſs, conſidered and retorted upon Romaniſts.

THe Pamphleter in his third Inſtance ſaith, *that Proteſtants deny the unbloody Sacrifice of Chriſts body and blood offered up to God in the Maſs.* Here it will be needful to hint at the true ſtate

ſtate of the queſtion betwixt Romaniſts and us, which the adverſary deceitfully ſhuns to unfold. We then confeſs that in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is a lively repreſentation, and a thankfull commemoration of the Sacrifice of Chriſt offered upon the Croſs, ſo that this Sacrament may be termed an improper Euchariſtick and commemorative Sacrifice, or as others ſpeak latreutical and objective. Nor did the Fathers of the ancient Church ever intend any more, as not only your divines have demonſtrated, but alſo among Romaniſts the learned *Picherell diſſert. de Miſſa. cap.* 2. but we deny that the ancient Church in thoſe three firſt ages held the Sacrament of the Lords Supper to be a proper propitiatory Sacrifice for the ſins of the living and dead, as is now defined by the Council of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 22. *Can.* 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. Yea, hardly will the name *Maſs* be found in the undoubted writings of the Fathers of the firſt three Ages, albeit *Baronius* in his *Annals* is bold to ſay that it is the moſt ancient name of this Sacrament, and was delivered to the Church at *Jeruſalem* by the Apoſtle *James*. Had it been ſo, Is it credible that neither *Ignatius*, nor *Irenæus*, nor *Juſtin Martyr*, nor *Tertul.* nor *Origen*, nor *Cyprian*, would once have made mention of the word *Maſs*? but for this impudent falſhood the Cardinal is ſufficiently chaſtiſed by *Cauſabon*, *Exercit.* 16. *an.* 34. *Num.* 39. The firſt notice that the ſame learned *Cauſabon*, and after him *D. Will. Forbes*, *lib.* 3. *de Sacrif. Miſſæ*, *cap.* 1. do obſerve of it was about 250 years after Chriſt, in an Epiſtle of *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome* to *Lupicinus*, and yet both of them doubt if this Epiſtle be genuine, and therefore I ſaid that hardly will the name *Maſs* be found in the undoubted writings of Ancients of theſe Ages.

But its not names we ſtand upon, and therfore. I affirm that though Fathers did often uſe the word *Sacrifice* concerning the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, yet they meant only an euchariſtick and commemorable Sacrifice, not proper and expiatory. This has been largly demonſtrated by many. I will hint at a few conſiderations, which I hope may Satisfie thoſe that are not obſtinately wilfull to adhere to a preconceived opinion.

And 1. the Fathers ſaid that they did Sacrifice to God, bread and win in the Euchariſt, ſo *Irenæus lib.* 4. *cap.* 32. *Cyprian Serm. de opere & Eleemoſynis*, and *epiſt.* 63. and *Auſtin epiſt.* 122. yea and the compyler of a part of the Miſſal (for its like a beggars cloak

cloak patched up at Severall times) Seems to have been of the ſame opinion, for before the Conſecration, its ſaid, *ſuſcipe pater hanc Immaculatam hoſtium*, but then by the Romaniſts own confeſſion, there is nothing but bread and wine; Now ſure it is, bread and wine can be no propitiatory Sacrifice to expiate the ſins of the Elect, *Ergo*, all theſe muſt be underſtood to ſpeak of an improper Euchariſtick and commemorative Sacrifice.

Secondly, the Fathers doe clearly expound themſelves to mean nothing elſe, *Chryſoſtom* who as often terms the Sacrament of the Supper a Sacrifice as any, expounds his meaning moſt clearly *Hom.* 17. *in Heb. we offer up*, ſaith he, *The ſame Sacrifice which Chriſt offered*, then he Subjoyns by way of Expoſition, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν θύομεν, *or rather the remembrance thereof.* So *Euſeb. lib.* 1. *de demonſtrat. cap.* 10. *he has commanded us to offer unto God* μνημὸν ἀντὶ θύματος, *a Memoriall, inſtead of a Sacrifice*, and *Auſtin*, *lib.* 20. *Cond. Fauſt. Manich.* cals it, *Sacramentum memoriæ*, a Sacrament of remembrance *Theoret*, *Clemens*, *Baſil*, and *Greg. Nazianzen* call the euchariſt Simbols and tips of the Sacrifice of Chriſt on the croſſe. The Chuch *Theodoret in Pſ.* 109. *offers to God the Simbols of Chriſts body and blood.* Theſe Fathers indeed (excepting *Clemens*) are poſterior to the 3d Century but their faith is conſonant to the faith of the Church in former ages, Hence *Iuſtin Martir in dial cum Triph. Pap.* 101. *edit Comelin*, *Chriſt commanded us to offer the bread of the Euchariſt*, *in recordationem paſſionis*, in remembrance of his Paſſion, and *Irenæus lib.* 4. *cap.* 34. makes this diſparity betwixt the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Sacrifice, *Species tantum mutata eſt*, the change is only in the outward formes, but ſure the Jewiſh Sacrifices were not the real Sacrifice of Chriſt, but repreſentations thereof, conſequently *Irenæus* looked on the euchariſt only as a repreſentative Sacrifice.

Thirdly, as the Euchariſt, ſo alſo Baptiſm was called by the Fathers a Sacrifice, the moſt of the Fathers, *plerique antiquorum*, if we may credit *Melchior Canu lib.* 12. *loc. com. c.* 13. *p.* 680. expound that of the Apoſtle *Heb.* 10. *There remains no more Sacrifice for ſin*, of Baptiſm. But Romaniſts will confeſs Baptiſm is no proper Sacrifice, why then do they not ſay the ſame of the Euchariſt.

Fourthly, as fathers ſay that Chriſt is Sacrificed in the euchariſt ſo are they found ſaying that he dyes and Suffers in that Sacrament. Hence *Greg.* is cited in the Canon law by *Gratian*, *de conſecrat. diſt.* 2. *cap.* 73. *quid ſit*, affirming that Jeſus dyes in the

miſtery of the euchariſt. Will any Romaniſt ſay, Chriſt properly dies or Suffers either in Baptiſm or in the Euchariſt, Nay ſays the Gloſs upon the laſt cited place, he is ſaid to die *quia mors ejus & paſſio repræſentantur*, why then do they not ſay the ſame concerning his Sacrifice? And indeed if he be properly Sacrificed then muſt he alſo properly die and Suffer.

Fifthly, when *Julian* the Apoſtate did object that Chriſtians had no proper Sacrifices *Cyril lib.* 9. *cont. Jul.* did admit they had only Spiritual Sacrifices, which he would never have yielded, if he had been of the Tridentin faith, that there is a proper propitiatory Sacrifice in the Maſs.

Sixly, this truth is ſo luculent, that it hath extorted confeſſions from eminent Doctors of the Romiſh Church, that the Sacrament of the Supper is called a Sacrifice, becauſe in it the Sacrifice of Chriſt on the croſſe is commemorated, ſo *Lombard lib.* 4. *ſent. diſt.* 12. *Aquinas. part.* 3. *queſt.* 83. *art.* 1. *Liranus in heb.* 10. *Picherel, diſſert. de Miſſa. Barneſius in Catholico Romano Pontif. ſect.* 7. to whom *D. William Forbes, de Miſſa cap.* 1. adds *Wicelius*, *Ferus*, and divers others.

Seventhly and *laſtly*, Romaniſts are ſo divided among themſelves touching this matter, that *Malderus* Biſhop of *Antwerp*, as cited by *D. Will. Forbes, pag.* 452. relates nine ſeveral opinions of Romaniſts, all which *Malderus* refutes, not excepting the opinion of *Bellarmin* himſelf. And yet ſays mine Author (who is known to have been no rigid Adverſary of Romaniſts) his own opinion was *nihilo melior*, no whit ſounder then the reſt. By theſe conſiderations I hope the diſcreet Reader may be ſatisfied, that though Fathers uſed the word Sacrifice, yet they meant only an Euchariſtick and commemorative Sacrifice.

To the Teſtimonies therefore objected by the Pamphleter, I anſwer in two words, *viz.* That the firſt three, namely, *from the Liturgy of James*, *Andrews Book of the Paſſion*, *Clements Epiſtle* 3. *as alſo that from Hippolitus de Anticbriſto* are cenſured as ſpurious, ſee *Cocus in Cenſur. pag.* 9. 21. 53. and 65. And *Rivet Crit. Sac. lib.* 1. *cap.* 3. 4. and 8. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 11. Yea, the faith of *James Liturgie* is queſtioned by *Bell. de ſcript. Eccleſ. an.* 34. and *lib.* 4. *de Euch. cap.* 3. *Andrews* Book by *Barronius*, *Tom.* 1. *an.* 44. *Num.* 42. 43. and *an.* 69. *Num.* 34. And *Clements* Epiſtles both by *Bell. de ſcript. Eccleſ. an.* 92. and *Barron. Tom.* 2. *an.* 102. *Num.* 6. 7. Secondly, that the reſt of the teſtimonies from *Ignatius*, *Irenæus*, *Tertul.* &c. are

are only to be underſtood of Euchariſtick, commemorative, and Symbolick Sacrifices, which might be confirmed by particular arguments from the ſeveral Authors, but I hope the premiſed conſiderations may ſuffice. Only leſt any ſhould imagine that the word *Maſs* was known in the days of *Ignatius*, that which the Pamphleter renders out of him to celebrate a *Maſs*, in *Ignatius Greek Epiſt. ad Smyrn.* ἐς ἀγάπην συνελθεῖν, which ſignifies only to celebrate a banquet. I may therefore here ſhut up with a new demonſtration of Popiſh Novelty.

That there is a proper propitiatory Sacrifice in the *Maſs*, was no eſſential of the Ancient Catholick Religion. But that there is a proper propitiatory Sacrifice in the *Maſs* is an eſſential in the preſent Romiſh Religion. *Ergo.* There is an other eſſential in the preſent Romiſh Religion, which was not in the Ancient Catholick Religion.

SECT. IV.

A fourth Inſtance of Novelty, concerning Tranſubſtantiation, diſcuſſed and retorted upon Romaniſts.

THe Pamphleter in his fourth Inſtance, ſaith, *that Proteſtants deny the real preſence and Tranſubſtantiation.* And toward the cloſe of this fourth Inſtance, *Pag.* 145. he would ſneakingly inſinuate, *that their half Communions* (which are ſo palpable an innovation, that their own Authors cannot deny it) *had been approven by the Ancient Church.* To this laſt I ſhall have a more fit occaſion to ſpeak in the firſt appendix to this, *Sect.* 7. And therefore at the time ſhall only examin that of Tranſubſtantiation. We deny not the real preſence, nay, we affirm that Chriſt is really exhibited to believers in the uſe of the Sacrament. That which we deny is a Tranſubſtantiated preſence, ſo as the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine are deſtroyed, a ſpecter of accidents without a Subject, remaining, and the body and blood of Chriſt being ſubſtituted under the accidents. In this we and not Romaniſts are conſonant to the Faith of the Ancient Church. Hence *Irenæus, lib.* 4. *cap.* 34. *the bread* (after conſecration) *is not now common bread, but an*

Euchariſt, conſiſting of two things, the terren, and the heavenly. Then in the Euchariſt two things are exhibited to believers, the terren, *viz*, Bread and Wine, and the Heavenly, the body and blood of Chriſt. And therefore the uſual *Objection* which the *Pamphleter* takes out of the ſame *cap. of Irenæus where the Father concluds againſt Hereticks that Jeſus is the Son of the maker of the World, becauſe that bread upon which thanks is given, is the body of the Lord, and that cup his blood*, makes nothing for Tranſubſtantiation, Nay it diſtroys it, Bread cannot be the body of Chriſt nor the cup his blood in a proper ſenſe, but in a figurative, and the force of *Irenæus* argument appears to be this, he that inſtituted the creatures of God as ſacred and exhibitive Symbols of his body and blood, muſt be the Son of God, Chriſt did ſo, *Ergo*, &c.

Tertullian is no leſs luculent, *lib.* 4. *Cont. Marcio. cap.* 40. expreſly calling the Bread a figure of his body, and then drawes an argument againſt *Marcion*, and other Hereticks to prove that Chriſt had a true and real body, becauſe it could not be the figure of his body, if he had not a true body. But if Romiſh Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation were true, *Tertull*, could never have uſed a more unhappy argument againſt *Marcion*, for if there be no real bread in the Sacrament, but a Phantaſm of accidents without a ſubject, this had rather given advantage to *Marcion*, who affirmed Chriſt to have a Phantaſtical body. Here I cannot but notice the prevarication of the Pamphleter, he mentions only theſe words of *Tertull, the Bread taken and diſtributed be made his body*, and then crys out, *what more cleer for Tranſubſtantiation?* But had he not mutilated *Tertullians* words, it would have appeared nothing could be more clear to overturn Tranſubſtantiation, for preſently *Tertull*, thus explains himſelf, *hoc eſt, figura corporis mei*, that is, *this is, the figure of my Body.* Yea, *Beatus, Rhenanus, in admon. de Tertul. dogm. reckons*, this as one of *Tertullians* ſentiments, that the body of Chriſt is only figuratively in the Euchariſt.

By this alſo may be cleared, what the Phamphleter *objects out of Ignatius Epiſt. ad Smyrnenſes that the Saturnian Hereticks did not admit of Euchariſts and oblations, becauſe they do not confeſs the Euchariſt to be our Saviours Fleſh.* For as. *Spalat. lib.* 5. *cap.* 6. *Num.* 151. well obſerves, though the Euchariſt be not properly

perly the Flesh of Christ, yet being a Symbol of his Flesh, it receives the denomination of the thing signified, and strongly proves that Christ hath real Flesh and a proper humane nature, which those Hereticks denyed. They therefore seeing the strength of this Argument rejected the Eucharist.

I add another testimony of *Tertullian lib. de anima. cap.* 17. *the senses*, saith he, *are not deceived about their own objects, lest thereby something of advantage might be yeelded to Hereticks, making but a Phantasm of Christ*, &c. But according to the tenet of Transubstantiators the senses of all the World are ludified, with *Tertullian* accords *Cyprian*, who *Epist.* 76. calls the Bread the body of Christ and the Wine his blood, which were a manifest falshood, if not figuratively understood. So likewise *Origen in Math.* 15. *that which is sanctified by the word of God and Prayer, according to the material part of it, goes into the belly, and is sent into the draught.* I desire to know by a Romanist, what is this material part of the Sacrament which goes into the draught, if the substance of bread do not remain? when therefore *Origen saith we eat and drink the body and blood of the Lord, in the place objected by the Pamphleter*, he can only be understood of a Symbolical and Mystical Eating and Drinking.

With those Fathers of the first three ages, these of following times do agree as appears by, *Theod. dial.* 1. where he says *that by the blessing of consecration, the nature of the elements is not changed, but grace added unto nature*, οὐκ ἐξέστατα τῆς οἰκείας φύσεως, *but abide in their proper nature shape and figure*, so much is affirmed by *Gelasius lib. de duabus naturis Christi contra Eutych. & Nestor. in bib. pat. tom.* 5. *part.* 3. So also *Augustin contra Adimantum, cap.* 12. and the Author of the Books *de sacramentis* going under the name of *Ambrose lib.* 4. *cap.* 4. *ut sint quæ erant, & in aliud convertantur*, that they may be what they were, and be converted into another thing. If they remain what they were, then sure their conversion into another thing, must be only Symbolical. A volume would hardly contain the testimonies of this nature which may be heaped up.

Scarce doth any testimony remain objected by the adversary which we have not cleared on the by, as we were bringing testimonies for the truth. His spurious testimonies I value not,

not, and ſuch is not only that *from Deny's lib. de Eccleſ. Hierarch cap.* 3. *but alſo that from Cyprian de cæna domini*, as is demonſtrated by Criticks, and yet neither of them make for Tranſubſtantiation. Not the firſt, or the *Pſeudo---Deny's* exclamation, *O diviniſſimum ſacramentum*, whither it be taken with Dr. *Morton*, as a Rhetorical apoſtrophe or with *Spalat*, as an invocation of Chriſt himſelf, who is the thing ſignified in the Sacrament. Nor the other aſcribed to *Cyprian*, wherein *the Elements are ſaid to be changed, not in ſhape, but in nature*, for nature is not taken for ſubſtance (elſe this ſhould be repugnant to the true *Cyprian*) but for the condition of theſe Elements, as when we ſay that things are of different nature, ſome common and prophane, others holy and Divine, in this ſenſe the Elements after conſecration are changed in their nature, beginning then to be of holy uſe and Divine vertue, albeit Learned *Salmaſius in Simplicio Verino, Pag.* 78. ſuſpects that teſtimony to be vitiated, and that it ought to be read *nec ſpecie, nec naturæ*, neither changed in ſhape, nor in nature, Romaniſts have committed many ſuch parricids on the writings of Fathers, ſo that here alſo I may conclude with a fourth demonſtration of Romiſh Novelty.

That the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine are deſtroyed in the Euchariſt, and the body and blood of Chriſt are ſubſtituted in their place, was no eſſential of Faith in the firſt three ages. But this is an eſſential of the preſent Romiſh Faith, *Ergo*, &c.

SECT. V.

A fifth inſtance of Novelty, concerning Purgatory examined and Retorted.

THe Pamphleter in his fifth Inſtance ſaith, *that Proteſtants deny Purgatory and Prayers for the dead*, Where Sophiſtically he throwes two Popiſh errors together. Well he knew that no ſolid teſtimony for Purgatory could be brought from the Church in the firſt three Centuries, therefore he adds to it, prayer for the dead, as if the Ancient Church had no other end in Praying for the dead, but to deliver them from the torments

torments of Purgatory, which ſhall appear to be a manifeſt falſhood.

Purgatory is indeed an Article of the Romiſh Faith, as appears by the Council of *Trent*, *ſeſs.* 6. *can.* 30. and *ſeſs.* 25. *decret. de Purg.* and *Bell. lib.* 1. *de Purg. cap.* 5. yea, ſo eſſential an Article that *T. C.* adverſary to the Arch. *Biſhop* of *Cant.* is bold to ſay, that we are under as much neceſſity to believe it, as the Trinity, or incarnation, nor is it wonder that they contend ſo earneſtly for it. For as *Spalat. lib.* 5. *de repub. Eccleſ. cap.* 8. *Sect.* 73. hath obſerved, it is the Doctrine which hath moſt enriched the Church of *Rome*. But it is as far from the Faith of the Ancient Chriſtian Church in the firſt three ages, as Hell is from Heaven. Is it not acknowledged by eminent Authors in the Romiſh Church, *Reffenſis art.* 18. *cont. Luth. Polid. Virg. lib.* 8. *de invent. rerum cap.* 1. *Alphonſus a Caſtro de hæreſ. lib.* 8. *verb. indulg.* and *lib.* 12. *tit. Purgatorium*, that it was but lately known to the Catholick Church, little or no mention of it made by *Greek* Fathers, and by the *Latins* themſelves received but by little and little. Yea, that to this day it is not believed by the *Greek* Church. Doth not *Sixtus Senenſis lib.* 6. *annot.* 259. confeſs that an apology written by *Marcus Metrop.* of *Epheſus* was given into the Council of *Baſil*, in name of the *Greek* Church diſapproving the Doctrine of Purgatory. And among themſelves there are Authors of great Note, who have denyed Purgatory, ſuch as Learned *Picherel*, *de miſſa cap.* 2. *Pag.* 250. *Barneſ. Cathol. Roman. Pacif. Sect.* 9. *L. D. ad finem paral.* and doth not *Thomas ab Albijs*, in his tractate. *de medio animarum ſtatu*, ſtrike at the Foundation of it?

But to leave theſe teſtimonies out of their own bowels, how far the Ancient Church was from believing Purgatory, to be an Article of Faith is copiouſly, and Learnedly demonſtrated by *Dallæus lib.* 6. *de pœnis & ſatisfac. per totum.* At the time let *Cyprian* ſuffice for all, *lib. ad Demet. cum iſthinc exceſſum fuerit, when once we paſs from this Life, there is no place for repentance, nor any effect of ſatisfaction*, ſure then no Purgatory, and a little before, to the ſame *Demet.* he ſays *that when this Life is* finiſhed, *ad æterna, vel mortis, vel immortalitatis hoſpitia dividimur*, we are divided to the eternal dwellings of death, or of immortality, where he acknowledges two ſtates after this Life, and

and both theſe eternal, and in *Serm. de lapſis*, he exhorts him that has ſinned to confeſs his ſin, *dum in ſæculo eſt*, while he is in this World, *dum admitti confeſſio ejus poteſt, dum ſatisfactio & remiſſio facta per ſacerdotem apud dominum gratia eſt*, where clearly he holds out, that after this Life, neither confeſſion, nor ſatisfaction can be accepted of God, and in his excellent treatiſe *de immortalitate*, this is one of his chief arguments, whereby he encourages Chriſtians againſt the fear of death, becauſe preſently after death, they are inveſted with eternal Life, *ejus eſt mortem timere, qui ad Chriſtum nolit ire, ejus eſt ad Chriſtum nolle ire, qui ſe non credat cum Chriſto incipere regnare*, if departed Saints begin to reign with Chriſt, then ſure they are not thruſt down to torments equivalent to the torments of Hell.

But did not the Ancient Church pray for the dead? *Anſw.* Its granted ſhe did, but not for a liberation from torments, under which ſhe ſuppoſed them to be preſently ſmarting, as do Romaniſts, and therefore from theſe Prayers, nothing can be concluded for Purgatory. The Ancient Church in their Prayers for the dead did pray for Martyrs, Apoſtles, Patriarchs, Prophets, the Virgin *Mary*, and for all the faithful, as appears from *Epiphanius hæreſ.* 75. and from the Liturgies that go under the names of *James*, and of *Chryſoſtom*, *in bib. pat. tom. 2. græco---latin*, and from the Liturgy of the Churches of *Egypt*, attributed to *Baſil*, *Greg*, *Nazianzen*, and *Cyril*, *in bib. pat. tom. 6. edit. 4. Cyprian likewiſe lib. 4. Epiſt. 5.* affirms, *they offered for the Martyrs who had received Palmes and Crowns.* Many more teſtimonies may be brought, but I ſum up all in that teſtimony of *Auſtin lib. de cura pro mortuis cap. 4.* who affirms that *Prayers were made for all that dyed in the Catholick Faith.* Seeing therefore the Ancient Church prayed for thoſe, who by the confeſſion of all were not in torment, but in a bleſſed ſtate, the ſcope of their Prayers was not for deliverance from the torments of Purgatory.

If any aske, for what then did they pray for the dead, *Bell.* is conſtrained to afford us an anſwer, for when he had objected to himſelf, *lib. 2. de Purg. cap. 5.* how in the *Maſs* for the dead they pray, *that the Souls of the faithful may be delivered from the pains of Hell, from the deep lake, from the mouth of the Lyon*, he *anſwers*, that although the Souls of the faithful at their particular judgment have received a ſentence, whereby they are delivered

delivered from Hell, yet there remains a general judgment, where they are to receive a ſolemn ſentence both as to Soul and Body, and that the Prayers of the Miſſal do relate to that laſt ſentence of the great day, the ſame may be ſaid to have been the ſcope of the Prayers of the ancient Church.

But yet further, to clear that the Prayers of the ancient Church had no reference to Purgatory. It would be remembred, that among ancient Chriſtians there were divers Errors concerning the ſtate of the departed, now juſtly diſowned both by Proteſtants and Papiſts, which might have given occaſion to theſe Prayers, as firſt, many of them were of opinion, that though all the Souls of the Faithful were *in requie*, in a bleſſed reſt, yet they were not admitted to the Beatifick Viſion before the day of Judgment. Hence *Sixtus Senenſis, lib. 6. Bibl. Annot.* 345. to prove that many in the ancient Church were ſmitten with this Error, he not only adduces teſtimonies from ſeveral particular Authors, ſuch as *Irenæus, Juſtin, Tertul. Origen, Lactantius, Prudentius, Ambroſe, &c.* but alſo the form of Prayer for the dead, in *James Liturgy*. 2. Many were of opinion, that all were to paſs through a fire of Purgatory at the great day. Yea, 3dly, ſome were of opinion, that by the Prayers of the living, the pains of the Damned were eaſed, among whom were *Chryſoſtom* and *Prudentius, &c.* of which ſee *Sixtus Senenſis, lib. 6. Annot.* 47. I ſhould not willingly mention theſe miſtakes and errors of Fathers, did not the importunity of Romaniſts conſtrain me to diſcover the miſapplications which are made of their Prayers to Purgatory. But generally they believed, that the Souls of the faithful at the preſent were *in requie*, and therefore *Tertul. lib. de Patientia*, accounteth it an injury to Chriſt to judge, that the Souls of departed Saints are in a ſtate to be pitied, theſe miſtakes of Ancients, being now through the mercy of God cleared, there is no reaſon to admit the ſuperſtructure built thereupon.

I cannot but add what learned *Dallee* hath obſerved, *lib. 6. de pœnis & ſatisfact. cap.* 2. that among all the Teſtimonies which *Bell.* hath muſtered up for Prayers for the Dead, there is none brought from the real writings of any Fathers, who died before the beginning of the 3d Century, and therefore judiciouſly concludes, that ſeeing there is no mention of them, either by *Moſes*, or the Prophets, or by Chriſt and the Apoſtles, or by the Fathers, who immediately ſucceeded to them, as *Ignatius, Ire-*

neus, or *Juſtin Martyr*, that upon the forementioned accounts they have been introduced into the Church towards the end of the 2d Century, but without any intuition to Purgatory. Had they been then deſigned for Purgatory, how came it that the Fathers never once gave this as the reaſon of theſe Prayers? When *Epiphanius* was demanded by *Aerius*, for what end Prayers were put up for the Dead, it had been eaſie to have anſwered, that it was for the deliverance of Souls out of Purgatory? But he brings other reaſons, and has nothing to that purpoſe, which is a clear demonſtration, that he was not of the preſent Romiſh Faith concerning Purgatory. And ſurely its built upon moſt abſurd Principles, ſuch as 1. the diſtinction of ſins Venial and Mortal, as if ſome ſins of their own nature did not deſerve everlaſting puniſhment. 2dly, That when God forgives ſin, he forgives not all the puniſhment thereof. 3dly, That Chriſt has not ſatisfied Juſtice fully for our ſins, ſeeing we muſt in part ſatisfy our ſelves for them.

The teſtimonies cited by the Pamphleter, having been often cleared by Proteſtant Authors, I ſhall ſpeedily diſpatch them, and firſt many of them, as from *Denys de Hierarch. cap.* 7. *Clements Conſtit. and Epiſtles, and James Liturgie are ſpurious*, and yet make nothing for the purpoſe. Learned *Dallæus de Pſeudepigraphis Apoſtolicis*, hath not only proved againſt Jeſuite *Turrian* and *Bovius* by Armies of arguments *Clements* conſtitutions to be ſpurious, but alſo *lib.* 1. *cap.* 1. ſhews them to be held as ſuch by moſt learned Romaniſts, *Bell. Barron. Perron. Margarinus de la Bigne, Albaſpinæus, Petavius, &c.* to whom afterwards he adds Pope *Gelaſius*, and *lib.* 2. *cap.* 17. he makes it probable that theſe conſtitutions were compiled by ſome Impoſtor, towards the end of the Fifth Century. However, theſe writings attributed to *Clemens, Denys*, and *James*, ſpeak of Prayers for them, who undoubtedly are in a bleſſed Eſtate, and therefore not for thoſe, who labour in the flames of Purgatory. Hence *Clemens lib.* 8. *conſtitut. cap.* 41. *pro quiſcentibus in Chriſto fratribus oremus*; and in the Liturgy aſcribed to *James*, *animas beatas requieſcere faciat Dominus*, and again, Prayers are put up for all the faithful from *Abel* the juſt, unto this day. Conſequently either none were in a bleſſed ſtate or their prayers are put up for ſuch. In the *citation of Origen*, he diſcovers little either of wit or honeſty. For who knows not that *Origen* was condemned, not only by *Epiphanius Epiſt. ad Joan. Hieroſ. Hierom, ad Pammach, Auſtin, Hereſ.* 43. *Auſtin de*

*de Civ. Dei. lib.*21. *cap.*17. but alſo by the 5th *Oecumenick Council*, yea, and by *Bell.* himſelf *lib.*1. *de purg. cap.*2. as maintaining there were no pains after this life but only Purgatory pains, and aſſerting that there ſhall be an end of the pains, both of Devils, and wicked men, and our Pamphleter had not ſo much judgment, as to obſerve that *Origen* aſſerted this his Hereſie in the teſtimony cited by him, *Ut efficiantur omnes aurum purum, that all may become pure gold*, ſhall *Judas*, ſhall *Cain*, ſhall devils at length become pure gold? as for *Tertull. in his book de coron. militis*, he ſpeaks only of prayer for the dead, which how it was uſed by the Ancient Church, I have already told, and in *his book de anima cap.* 58. he makes mention indeed of a *carcer inferni*, but truly means no Purgatory, but only the common receptacle of ſaints, untill the day of judgment, for a litle before *cap.* 55. he clears himſelf ſaying, *conſtituimus omnem animam apud inferos ſequeſtrari in diem domini*, *and* there upon *Bell.* concluds him to be one of thoſe, who mantained the elect were not admitted to the beatifick viſion, untill the day judgment, and the rather he calls it a *Carcer*, for according to his Chiliaſt fancy, he thought not that all ſhould riſe alike, but ſome ſooner, ſome latter, according to their degrees of ſins or graces.

From *Cyprian* he cites that commonly obiected Place, *ex Epiſt. ad Anton. its one thing to be amended for ſins by long grief, and to by purged with fire a long while, another to have purged away all ſins by ſuffering Martirdome*, but this nothing concerns Purgatory. As not only our divines, but ſome of there own alſo, as *Rigaltius* and *Albaſpinæus* have ſhowed, that *Cyprian* is there only ſpeaking of the ſeverities of diſcipline, which the *lapſi* under went in order to pardon, and comparing them with the felicity where of Martyrs after death are poſſeſſed. That purging fire is the ſeverity of Church diſciplin, which in primitive times was very long drawn out, neither needs it ſeeme ſtrange to any, that its compared to a fire ſeeing *Hierom* diſcribing the penitentiall exerciſes of *Fabiola*, *Epitaph. fab. ad Oceanum* ſaies, *Sedit ſuper Carbones ignis hi fuerunt in adjutorium*, and Pope *Siricius in epiſt. ad Himmer* calls perpetuall repentance, *purificatorium pœnitudinis ignem*, the purging fire of Repentance, and that this is the genuine ſcope of *Cyprian*, might be confirmed from the ſeries of his diſcourſe, but who deſires farther ſatisfaction, I remit them to *Dallæus de pœnis & ſatisfac. lib.*4. *cap.*10.

Now only remains *Auſtin*, who is the firſt Father that really ſpeaks to this purpoſe, about the end of the fourth, or beginning of the fifth Century, but ſure it is, *Auſtin* concluded nothing dogmatically in this matter, as may appear, by his, *non redarguo, quia forſitan verum eſt, lib.* 21. *de civ. dei cap.* 26. That which is here *objected* from him *in Pſ.* 37. is to be underſtood of the exploratory fire at the great day, as appears by a like diſcourſe of *Auſtin* on a paralel penitential, *Pſalm, viz. Pſalm*, 6. where he expreſly reſtricts his ſpeech to the day of Judgment.

Though none of theſe Authors which the Pamphleter has gathered up implicitly from his maſters, do favour his cauſe, yet I confeſs he wants not patrons for his Purgatory, and ſome of them very Ancient. *viz, Platonick Philoſophs*, he might truely have cited Lines out of *Virgil, Claudian*, &c. Yea, and perhaps from the *Turkiſh Alcoran*, and the *Jewiſh Talmud*, from all which *Bellarmin* is not aſhamed to argue, *lib.* 1. *de Purg. cap.* 11. we do not envy them theſe heathniſh, and Infidel abettors. Our Learned Countrey man, Dr. *Forbes of Corſe, lib.* 13. *inſtruct. Hiſt. Theol. cap.* 1. after a paralel betwixt the Romiſh Purgatory, and the old dreams of Platonick Philoſophs, *Montanus* and *Origen*, concluds, *they have borrowed ſomething from Origen, more from Montanus, but moſt of all from the Platoniſts*: I conclude with that of *Auſtin lib.* 1. *de pecc. merit. & remiſs. cap.* 28. *non eſt locus medius, ut poſſit eſſe niſi cum diabolo, qui non eſt cum Chriſto*, and the Author *Hypog. lib.* 5. *Tertium ignoramus, nec in ſcripturis invenimus*, hence emerges a fifth demonſtration of Romiſh Novelty.

That the Souls of the faithful undergo Purgatory pains after this Life, was no eſſential of the Chriſtian Faith in the firſt three ages. But it is an eſſential of the preſent Romiſh Faith, *Ergo*, &c.

SECT. VI.

A ſixth inſtance of Novelty, concerning invocation of Saints, examined and retorted upon Romaniſts.

THe Pamphleter in his ſixth Inſtance, ſaith, *that Proteſtants deny invocation and Honouring of Saints*, where he bewrays either

either groſs ignorance, or ſo much diſingenuity, as to verify in himſelf his other Apocryphal Text, *quod interiora ejus ſint plena dolo*, for though Proteſtants deny invocation of departed Saints, yet they acknowledge they ought to be honoured. They cordially homologate that of *Auſtin de vera relig. cap.* 55. *honorandi ſunt propter imitationem, non adorandi propter Religionem.*

It will prove an hard province to all the Romaniſts of the World, to produce one anthentick Inſtance for invocation of Saints within the firſt three ages, either from Canonical or extra---Canonical Authors. For as to Canonick Writers, *Eccius* a violent Romaniſt, *in Enchirid, cap.* 15. acknowledges that there is no explicite command for invocation of Saints, either in the Old or New Teſt. And for extra---Canonical Authors *Sixtus Senenſis, lib.* 6. *Bibl. annot.* 345. reckons out many in the firſt three ages, *Irenæus, Juſtin Martyr, Tertul. Clemens Romanus*, and *Origen*, to whom in after times, he adds *Lactantius, Victorinus, Prudentius, Ambroſe, Chryſoſt.* Yea, and Pope *John the* 22. maintaining, that Saints do not enjoy the beatifick viſion before the reſurrection of the laſt day, and though he hint at a piteous evaſion to draw ſome of their words another way, yet the evidence of truth makes him acknowledge, that all their words could not bear ſuch an interpretation, Conſequently theſe could not maintain a proper invocation of departed Saints, this being the reaſon why *Bell. lib.* 1. *de beat Sanct. cap.* 20. concluds, *that Saints under the Old Teſtament were not invocated becauſe they were not yet admitted to the beatifick viſion.* Did not the Fathers of thoſe ages explicitly reject invocation of Angels, as *Irenæus lib.* 2. *cap.* 25. reckoning invocation of Angels, and incantations together, as things not practiſed by the Church. And *Origen lib.* 5. *cont Celſum & lib.* 8. ſays *that our Prayers are to be offered up to God alone by his only begotten Son*, and why Angels are not to be invocated, he brings diverſe reaſons. How is it that in the excellent tractats concerning Prayer, written by *Tertul.* and *Cyprian*, there is no mention of invocation of Saints? How is it that in all the Sermons of *Origen* there are no *ave Maries* or *invocation of Saints* recommended? Do not Romiſh Catechiſts in expounding the firſt command, labour to reconcile their invocation of Saints with the prohibition of that command, but *Origen in Exod.*

Exod. homil. 8. though he prolixly treat of that command, makes no mention of invocation of Saints. Are not these evidences, that invocation of Saints was not then in fashion? Do not the Fathers of these ages define Prayer to be directed to God alone? So *Tertul. de orat. cap.* 1. *&* 9. *apol. cap.* 30. *Iren. lib.* 1. *cap.* 32. *cap.* 35. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 17. *Origen cont. Celsum lib.* 5. *& lib.* 8. and after them *Athanasius orat.* 4. *cont. Arrianos.* Well did *Ambrose* express the sense of the Church *de obit. Theod. Tu Domine solus invocandus es*, should not the argument of *Athanasius orat.* 4. *cont Arrianos* concluding the deity of Christ, because he was invocated be very inconsequent, if the invocation of Saints had been judged lawful. When in the fourth Century invovation of Saints began to creep in, was it not doubted if departed Saints knew particularly the affaires of the living. Hence *Nazianzen's*, *εἰ τὶς αἰσθήσις*, *orat.* 3. and *ὡς οἶμαι orat. funeb. in laudem Basilii, Hierom in Epitaph. Nepotiani, non audit quicquid dixero, Ambrose, de obitu Satyri; cum quo loqui non possumus*, &c. How could they then hold it as an Article of Faith, that Saints are to be invocated? Did not the *Council of Laodicea can.* 35. condemn expresly the invocation of Angels? Is it not a notorious imposture of Romanists, to substitute for, *Angelos*, either in the Title, Text, or Margin, *Angulos*, as is observed to be done by *Caranza*, *Crab*, *Binnius*, *Canisius*. Is not that Canon commended and the worship of Angels condemned by *Theodoret in cap.* 2. *ad Coloss.*

Doth not the Pamphleter bewray how desperat his cause is, when all the testimonies he brings, are ejther spurious or impertinent. These from *Denys de Hierarch cap.* 7. *Clements Apost. constut. Cornelius* 1. *Epist.* and *Origens Lament.* are all spurious, and most of them quite impertinent. That of *Clement* (which should have been cited. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 7.) speaking only of Honour due to Saints, that of *Cornelius* (which not only *Cocus in censura Pag.* 36. has demonstrated to be spurious, but also, as *Barronius ad an.* 221. *n.* 6. confesses, *non est perinde exploratæ fidei*) of the intercession of Saints, neither of which are denyed. Who may not see a vast difference betwixt intercession, and invocation? Saints in time do intercede for the Church, and sure their charity being inlarged in Heaven, they cease not to intercede for her. But the Question is, if we be to invocate them Religiously, or if they know all the particular wants of Souls

Souls on Earth. This is more then will be proven, either by Scripture, or primitive Antiquity. That *lamentation or penitential of Origen*, is declared apocryphal by Pope *Gelaſius*, witneſs *Barron. ad an.* 253. *n.* 118. Concerning that of *Denys lib. de hierarch Eccleſ. cap.* 7. it hath oft been told Romaniſts, particularly by Dr. *Will. Forbes controv.* 3. *cap.* 3. *Pag.* 308. By *Dallæus lib.* 1. *de object. cultus religioſ. cap.* 8. and by Dr. *Fern in his anſwer to Scripture miſtaken, Sect.* 2. *pag.* 262. That it is ſpoken of the Prayers of the living for the dead, not of Prayers to the dead, and cannot but be obvious to any that have read the Book it ſelf He cites *Cyprian lib.* 4. *Epiſt.* 9. ſpeaking of the commemoration of the ſufferings of Martyrs, but *Cyprian* has nothing to that purpoſe in that Epiſtle? Only he vindicates himſelf from ſome calumnies to *Florentius*, *Pupianus*, indeed *lib.* 3. *Epiſt.* 6. he ſpeaks of the memories of the Martyrs, but what is that to invocation? The ſufferings of Martyrs were commemorated, to excite the living to follow their footſteps, but not for invocation. Might he not have Learned from *Auſtin lib.* 22. *de civ. dei cap.* 10. *Martyres nominari non invocari*, that Honourable mention is made of them in the publick ſervice of the Church, but not invocated.

None of the teſtimonies alleadged for invocation, or adoration of Saints have a ſhaddow of Pertinency, but that of *Juſtin Martyr. apol.* 2. and that is an egregious impoſture, and ſo long agoe diſcovered, that Cardinal *du Perron* in his large diſpute concerning invocation of Saints with King *James* the ſixth is aſhamed to alleadge any thing out of *Juſtin Martyr*, But this *Simpleton* ſcrapes out any thing he finds in *Bell.* Its objected therefore by *Bell. lib. de beat Sanct. cap.* 13. that *Juſtin Martyr Apol.* 2. *taught that Chriſtians did worſhip God the Father, and the Son, and the whole hoſte of good Angels, and the holy Ghoſt*, could there be a greater indignity done to this holy Father, and Martyr, then to make him aſcribe the ſame Religious worſhip to Angels, which is given to the Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt? Are not Papiſts themſelves aſhamed to be ſo groſs, and ſhall we beleeve, that in enumerating the objects of worſhip, *Juſtin* would have put Angels before the holy Ghoſt? Doth not the ſame *Juſtin* expreſly affirm a little after *Pag.* 150. Διὰ τοῦτο μόνον προσκυνοῦμεν, wherefore we worſhip God alone. If then it be asked, what *Juſtin Martyr* ſays, in the place objected.

jected? Anſwer, *Juſtin* ſays only, that we worſhip the Father and the Son (who teaches the whole hoſte of good Angels) and the holy Ghoſt, ſo *Juſtin* makes only God the Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt, the object of adoration, and Angels only are ſaid to be taught by the Son of God. Yet the Cardinal is not aſhamed to impoſe that blaſphemy on *Juſtin Martyr*, as if he had aſſerted Angels ſhould be adored, with the Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt, whom this Pedantick Pamphleter follows. That this is the genuine ſenſe of *Juſtin*, any may ſee, by looking on the Text of *Juſtin Pag.* 45. *edit Comelin*, and the verſion of *Langus* a Popiſh Author, who has rendred the words of *Juſtin* in *Latin*, as I have Engliſhed them, and yet further this may be confirmed, ſeeing *Pag.* 47. where *Juſtin* is again diſcribing the object of adoration, we worſhip ſays he, firſt the Father, ſecondly the Son, and thirdly the holy Ghoſt without any mention of Angels at all.

How much Romaniſts have wrangled with their own conſciences in this matter of invocation of Saints, may appear, when their Jeſuit *Suarez in defenſ. fid. cathol. lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. *n.*21. acknowledges, *that Chriſtians may be ſaved though they do not invocate Saints*, and Cardinal *Perron* declared to *Iſaac Caſaubon he had never all his time invocated Saints, except he had fallen to be at a proceſſion*, then he had ſaid with the multitude *ora pro nobis*, and *Wecel. in methodo concordiæ* as cited by Dr. *Will. Forbes Pag.* 285. *wiſhed that invocation of Saints might not be held as an Article of Faith.* Yea, *Rivet*, in his animadverſions, upon *Grotius* Notes on *Caſſanders* Conſultation. *art.* 21. brings in *Wicelius* utterly condemning invocation of departed Saints, as injurious to God and our Saviour Chriſt Jeſus. And many of their Doctors have denyed invocation to be an Act of Religion, as *Thomas* 2. 2. *q.* 81. *art.* 1. *Vaſq. in* 3. *part. tom.* 1. *diſp.* 98. *cap.* 1. and *Valent. lib.* 3, *de Idol. cap.* 7. Yet *Bell. lib.* 1. *de beat Sanct. in ord. diſp.* will have it *eximium adorationis genus*. How in the Roman Church the adoration of Chriſt is obſcured by the invocation of the Virgin *Mary*, and of other Saints, may be ſeen in *Caſſander in defenſ. libelli de officio viri pii. Pag.* 849. and 850. *edit. pariſ.* 1616. and *in conſult. de merit. & interceſs. Sanct.* ſeeing they are invocated with more confidence then Chriſt himſelf, *neque id à vulgo tantum imperito factitatum eſt*, (ſaith he) *ſed & Doctorum etiam ſcriptis & concionibus comprobatum*, do they not thus pray,

ora

ora patrem, jube filio, &c. *O felix puerpera, piam ſcelera, jure matris impera Redemptori.* Yea, not only do they invocate and adore Saints recorded in Scripture, but alſo Saints of their own canonization. Doth not *Bell. lib. de beat Sanct. cap.* 8. affirm it to be the common opinion that this power of canonization does appertain to the Pope, and *cap.* 9. that thoſe whom he Canonizes without doubt are to be worſhipped, Yet have they neither Scripture, nor Antiquity for this. Yea, this being a matter of fact according to their own principles, the Pope may ſurely erre therein; And Conſequently they may pray to damned reprobats, in ſtead of Saints, as *Caſſand. in Conſult. de Ven. Relig.* tells how the bones of a robber were adored, in ſtead of the reliques of a Saint. This might afford us a ſixth demonſtration of the Novelty of the preſent Romiſh Religion.

That Saints are to be invocated being an Article of the preſent Romiſh Religion. But not of the Ancient Chriſtian Religion in the firſt three ages.

SECT. VII.

A Seventh Inſtance of Novelty, concerning Croſſes and Images, examined and retorted.

THe Pamphleter in his ſeventh Inſtance ſaith, *Proteſtants deny the uſe of the Croſs and Images.* Have Jeſuits loſt all ſhame with their ingenuity? How groſly is this queſtion miſſtated? Do Proteſtants deny the uſe of Images and croſſes? May not Images be ſeen dayly adorning the walls of their houſes? I had thought that *Campian* the Jeſuit and *Garnet* Provincial of their order in England, found the Proteſtants do not altogether diſallow the uſe of Croſſes.

Know therefore its the Religious adoration of Images, and Croſſes, which we condemn. In this we have the full conſent of Scriptures, and of Antiquity. Nay I appeal all the generation of Jeſuits to produce one Inſtance of the Religious adoration, either of Images, or Croſſes within 300. Years after Chriſt, for this Pamphleter has brought none. Did not all the Fathers of theſe times, particularly *Irenæus,*

lib. 5. *cap.* 3. *Pag.* 478. 479. *edit Pariſ.* 1545. *Juſtin Martyr, apol.* 2. *Pag.* 49. 50. *edit Comelin* 1593. the Church of *Smyrna in Euſeb. lib.* 4. *cap.* 15. *Theoph. Antioch. lib.* 2. *& lib.* 3. *ad Autol. tom.* 1. *bib. pat. edit.* 2. *Clemens Alex. lib.* 6. *Strom. Tertul. apol. cap.* 17. *& in Scorp. cap.* 4 *Origen Contra Celſum lib.* 4. *homil.* 30. *in Luc, Cyp. Epiſt.* 56. *ad Pleb. Thib.* aſſert that God alone is to be worſhipped, and Conſequently neither Croſs, nor Image? Are not Romiſh inquiſitors ſo offended with ſuch like aſſertions in Fathers, that *Bernard de Sandoval* Spaniſh inquiſitor, as is noted by *Dallæus lib.* 2. *de objecto cultus relig. cap.* 2. hath bloted out of *Athanaſius* his Index theſe words, which had been taken from his *orat.* 3. *contra Arrian. adorari ſolius dei eſſe?* Was not this one of the great objections of the Heathens againſt Ancient Chriſtians, that they uſed no Images in their worſhip, as is to be ſeen in *Origen cont. Celſum lib.* 8. *Minut. in Octavio, Arnobius cont. Gentes lib.* 6? Do not the latter *Jews* ſince the Chriſtian Church was corrupted by Image worſhip, upbraid Chriſtians therewith? There was a famous dialogue Written a little before the ſecond Council of *Nice*, as is related *Act.* 5. In which a Jew is brought in, thus ſpeaking to a Chriſtian, *Scandalizor in vos, Chriſtiani, quia Imagines adoratis.* I am offended at you Chriſtians, becauſe you worſhip Images. Whence is it, that the Fathers of the firſt three Centuries, who diſputed with the *Jews*, ſuch as *Juſtin Martyr in dial. cum Tryphone* and *Tertul lib. cont. Judæos* met with no ſuch crimination from them, but becauſe there was no Image worſhip in the Church in thoſe days? Do not the Fathers of thoſe ages expreſly condemn Image worſhip, and croſs worſhip? Hence *Tertul. apol. cap.* 12. we do not worſhip ſtatues, and Images like unto the dead, whom they repreſent, and which Birds and Spiders underſtand well enough to be dead things. *Origen lib.* 7. *contra Celſum*, its impoſſible that he who knows God, ſhould be a worſhipper of ſtatues, *Minut. Felix in Octavio, cruces nec colimus, nec optamus*, we neither worſhip croſſes, nor deſire them. *Arnobius lib.* 6. *cont. Gentes* reckons it a moſt abſurd thing, *opem a deo ſperare, & ad effigiem nullius ſenſus deprecari. Lactantius lib.* 2. *Inſtitut. cap.* 2. holds it madneſs to worſhip Images, and to Image worſhippers applys that of *Perſius. O curvæ in terras animæ & cæleſtium inanes.* Did not that Ancient Council of *Eliberis can.* 36. decree that Picturs ought not to be in the Church? Yea, were not

not the Fathers of thoſe times ſo far from Image worſhip, that diverſe of them did condemn the art of Painting Images, and graving ſtatues? *Tertul.* alleadges *lib. de Idol. cap.* 3. the Devil to be the inventor of them: they were alſo diſallowed by *Clemens of Alexandria protrept Pag.* 41. and *Strom lib.* 6. *Pag.* 587. *edit Lutet.* 1629. and by *Origen lib.* 4. *cont. Celſum.* I am not juſtifying their opinion in this. Dr. *Jer. Taylour* puts ſome faire Gloſs upon it, *in duct. dub. lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. *Pag.* 345. 346. but had Images been as frequent in the Chriſtian Church then, as now in the Romiſh, is it like thoſe Fathers would have condemned the very painting and ſtatuary arts? Should any do ſo now among Romaniſts, how would the Vatican thunder anathema's againſt them? Many more evidences could be brought that the Catholick Church in the firſt three ages, was a ſtranger to the now Image worſhip of Romaniſts, let theſe for the time ſuffice.

Only I muſt remember the Reader of the ſubdiviſions of Romaniſts touching this thing, Some as *Durand* and a *Caſtro* deny the Image in it ſelf at all to be adored, but the *Prototype* before the Image, but theſe are backed with a very ſmall train, and generally diſallowed. Others therefore on the contrary hold that they are to be adored with the ſame worſhip with the *Prototype*, for this *Bell. lib.* 2. *de Imag. cap.* 20. cites *Aquinas*, *Bonaventure*, *Cajetan*, *Marſilius*, *Almainus*, *Carthuſianus*, *Capreolus*, *hæc ſententia*, ſaith *Azor Part.* 1. *Moral. lib.* 9. *cap.* 6. *communi theologorum conſenſu eſt recepta.* According to theſe Images of Chriſt, and the croſs are to be adored with *Latrie*, of the Virgin, with *Hyperdulie*, and of ordinary Saints, with *dulie*. There be a third ſort, who ſay Images are to be adored with an inferiour kind of Religious worſhip then the *Prototype*, yet ſuch as analogically belongs to the ſame Species, thus *Bell. Perron*, *Catharinus*, &c. according to theſe, the Images of Chriſt are to be adored with *Latrie*, yet not ſimply ſo called, but analogically. What ſhall the ignorant multitude do, when their Doctors are no leſs divided then the builders of Babel? How can they underſtand what an analogical *Latrie* and *dulie* is? Much wiſer was the Heathen *Varro*, who in *Aug. lib.* 4. *de civ. dei cap.* 31. teſtifies, *that the Ancient Romans about* 170. *years worſhipped the Gods without an Image*, adding, *quod ſi adhuc manſiſſet, caſtius obſervarentur dii.* which obſervation of *Varro* is commended by *Auguſtin.*

As for the Pamphleters teſtimonies for croſſes and Images, diverſe of them are ſpurious, yea and fabulous, and all of them impertinent, Not one of them Speaking of the religious adoration of Images, or croſſes, which is the matter in queſtion betwixt Romaniſts and us. So I might let all paſs, yet take this ſtructure of them. He cites three concerning the croſs, *Denys lib. 2. de Hierarch. Eccleſ. cap. 2.* (whereas *Denys* hath but one book *de Hierarch. Eccleſ.* but the Pamphleter behaved to writt after his copy in *H. T. Manual, art. 22*) *Martial epiſt. ad Burdegal, and Tertull de corona militis cap.* 3. the firſt two are ſuppoſititious, that of *Martial ad Burdegal*, is demonſtrated by *Bell. de ſcript ; eccles. Pag.* 60. to be Spurious. The Third is Supposed by ſome to be written by *Tertull.* in his Montaniſm. They import no more, but that the ſigne of the Croſſe was uſed to ſhew Chriſtians were not aſhamed of a crucified Saviour. But how farr they were from adoration of the croſs, may be collected from *Ambroſe de obitu Theodoſii*, ſpeaking of that ſtory (or fable as ſome Suppoſe) *Helena* the Mother of *Conſtantin* her finding the croſſe of Chriſt, *Regem* (ſays he) *adoravit, non Lignum, utique hic gentilis eſt error, & vanitas impiorum.* She worſhipped the King, i. e. Chriſt, not the tree, and that becauſe its a heathenith errour, and vanity of the wicked to worſhip ſuch things religiouſly.

That which he cites out of *Tertull. lib. 2. de pud.* was not only an emblematick repreſentation of the parable of the loſt ſheep; for ornament or inſtruction, upon glaſſen cups, which is vaſtly different from the ſetting up Images for adoration. The *ſtory of the Image of Chriſt ſent to Prince Abgarus*, hath been often convicted to be meer fable, there being no mention of it by ancients until *Euagrius*, about 600. years after Chriſt, is it like that *Euſebius*, who *lib. 1. hiſt. cap.* 14. makes mention of letters betwixt Chriſt and *Abgarus*, would have ſpoken nothing of that Image had it been reall? Theſe letters alſo are Pronounced apocriphal in the Canon law *diſt.* 15. *cap. Sanſta. Romana eccleſia. Metaphraſtes* is a late hiſtorian in the 9th Century, of ſmall Credit, even with Romiſh writers, as may be ſeen in *Bell. de ſcript. Eccleſ. Damaſcen* was a violent promoter of Image worſhip, and therefore neither of them are fit witneſſes in this matter. More notice is to be taken of *the Statue which the Hemoroos woman is ſaid to have erected at Cæſarea Philippi.* Its true *Euſeb.* ſpeaks thereof *lib.* 7. *cap.* 14. But it is true, that its long ſince the faith of that Rela-

Relation was queſtioned by the authour of the work, which goes under the name of *Charles* the great *lib. 4. cap.* 15. and not with-probable reaſons, Is it not ſtrange, that none of the Evangeliſts, nor *Irenæus*, nor *Juſtin Martyr*, nor *Tertul.* nor *Origen*, ſhould make mention of that ſtatue, or that miraculous herb? How could that woman who ſpent all her living on *Phyſicians*, be able to erect theſe brazen ſtatues? is it probable that Heathens would ſuffer ſuch monuments of Chriſt to ſtand 300. years undemolliſhed? That there were ſtatues at *Ceſarea* cannot rationally be doubted ſeeing *Euſeb.* does teſtify he ſaw them, but there is cauſe to queſtion whether they were built by that woman, or that one of them was Chriſts, and the rather ſeeing *Euſeb.* brings no certain author for it but a rumour. Finally, granting ſhe had erected that ſtatue to Chriſt, yet *Euſeb.* ſays not that it was *worſhiped*, nay he affirms, it was erected ἐθνικὴ συνηθείᾳ. by an heatheniſh cuſtome. Proteſtants doe not deny, but there were portraitures of Chriſt and Apoſtles in thoſe dayes, as *Euſeb.* there doth witnes, but *Euſeb.* is ſo clear from aſſerting that they wer uſed in Churches, as objects of Religion adoration, that in the Second *Nicen Councell Act.* 6. he is brought in teſtifying to *Conſtantia* the Empreſs againſt the making of the Image of Chriſt, had it not then been the Pamphleters wiſdom to have held his peace of *Euſebius*. He is as unadviſed in mentioning *Auſtin l.* 1. *de conſenſu evangel. cap.* 10. for there he condemns them who ſtudy Chriſt, *non in Sanctis codicibus, ſed in pictis parietibus.* His ſtory *of the Image made by Nicodemus* is an evident fiction, and the book out of which it is taken, *de paſſione imaginis Chriſti, attributed to Athanaſius* is ſuppoſititious, as is proved, by *Cocus Pag.* 93. 95. and ſeems to be forged by Image worſhippers about the time of that Idolatrous Second *Nicen Councel*, yea, *Bell. de ſcript. Eccl. in Athan.* confeſſes it not to be written by *Athanaſius*, but in the eight Century, when the controverſy about *Image worſhip*, was in agitation. That *Image of the Virgin Mary, ſaid to be drawn by* Luke, appears likewiſe to be fabulous, there being no authour making mention thereof until *Euagrius* about the end of the ſixt Century, the Apoſtle *Paul* calls *Luke* a Phiſician, but not a Painter, Nor is it probable, if he were a Jew, they not uſing ſuch artiſts, if we may believe *Origen lib.* 4. *cont. Celſum.* As little faith is to be given to what is alleadged *out of Damaſus Pontificall of the Images of Chriſt, and of the Baptiſt, erected by Conſtantin*, for that Pontificall is not only proven to be Suppoſititious by *Cocus Pag.* 139. but alſo acknowledged by *Baronius*, *Binius*,

Binius, *Poſſevin*, yea *Bell. lib. de ſcript. Eccleſ.* aſcribes it to *Anaſtaſius* the bibliothecary, who lived in the 9th Century, a groſſe Image worſhipper, at leaſt it ſeems interpolated by him. Neither is it likely that this would have been omitted by *Euſebius*, who is ſo accurate in deſcribing what was done by *Conſtantin*. By this it appears that moſt of the ſtories which Romaniſts alleadge concerning their Images are meer Fables, But grant they were real Hiſtories, they ſpeak not at all of adoration, which is the only thing in controverſy. Yet I ſhall help my adverſary to ſome preſidents of great Antiquity for the adoration of Images, but its from Hereticks, ſuch as the *Gnoſticks* in *Iren. lib.* 1. *cap.* 24. and *Carpocratians* in *Epiphan.* in *Hæreſ. Carpocratianorum* and *Auſtin Hæreſ.* 7. ſuch preſidents we do not envy them. But as to the Catholick Church they may hear their own *Clemanges in lib. de novis celebritatibus non inſtituendis*, who ſaith, *statuit olim univerſalis Eccleſiæ, ut nullæ in templis imagines ponerentur.*

Hence might be deduced another demonſtration of the Novelty, of the preſent Romiſh Religion, ſeeing it approves the Religious adoration of croſſes and Images, whereof no veſtige can be found in the Catholick Church of the firſt three ages.

SECT. VIII.

An eight inſtance of Novelty, concerning Free-will examined and Repelled.

THe Pamphleter in his eight Inſtance, ſaith, *that Proteſtants deny Free-will, ſince the fall of Adam.* Behold another *Jeſuitiſm!* that is, an arrant Cheat. Do not our Authors, as Learned *Uſher* in his anſwer to the Jeſuits challenge, *Pag.* 464. *Chamier Panſtrat. tom.* 3. *lib.* 3. *cap.* 1. *ſect.* 10. *Pareus contra præfat. Bell. ad lib. de grat. de lib. arb.* poſitively proteſt, that they do not deny free-will? We do abominate the madd Sects of *Manichees*, *Valentinians*, &c. Who either by fatal or ſimply natural neceſſity, do quite overthrow the liberty of human wills, which of us, ever doubted whether Popes, Cardinals, and Jeſuits do practiſe their impieties freely? We cordially ſubſcribe to that of *Auſtin lib.* 1. *ad Boniface. cap.* 2. *quis noſtrum dicat, quod primi hominis peccato perierit liberum arbitrium de humano genere? Libertas quidem perijt, ſed illa quæ in paradyſo fuit.* Well did the ſame *Auſtin* ſay *lib. de nat. & gra. cap.* 66, *quod ſit quædam*

dam peccandi neceſſitas, that unregenerate perſons have brought upon themſelves a kind of neceſſity of ſinning, yet that neceſſity is well conſiſtent with liberty. Hence *Auſtin lib.* 1. *ad Bonifac. cap.* 2. *liberum arbitrium uſque adeo in Peccatore non periit, ut perillud peccent maxime qui cum dilectatione peccant*, free-will is ſo far from being loſt in ſinners, that by it, they who ſin with greateſt delight, ſin moſt egregiouſly. Devils cannot but ſin, and yet ſin moſt freely. Proteſtants grant no leſs indifferency to the will of the ſinner then *Auſtin* of old in his debates againſt the *Pelagians*, yea, as much as *Dominicans* and *Thomiſts* do require to the nature of Liberty. Will he ſay that all theſe do dogmatize concerning free-will contrary to the Faith of the Church in the firſt three ages? Indeed we cannot adorn mans free-will with ſuch elogies as did the *Pelagians* or *Semipelagians* of old, or as their Jeſuited and Arminian of-ſpring, which do exceedingly derogate from the neceſſity, and efficacy of free grace. I will not take up time in mentioning all the heads of controverſy betwixt the Catholick Church and the *Pelagians* or *Semipelagians*. Only two things I pitch upon. 1. We aſſert the neceſſity of ſupernatural grace to every good work. This Learned *Voſſius lib.* 3. *Hiſt. Pelag. Part.* 2. copiouſly demonſtrates not only to have been the Doctrin of *Auguſt. Proſper, Fulgentius*, to the Councils of *Dioſpolis, Araufica, Carthage*, and of the whole Catholick Church after that the *Pelagian* hereſy was broached, but alſo *Part.* 1. confirms it to be the perpetual Doctrin of the Fathers and Church before the appearing of *Pelagius*. Of the *Latin* Fathers, he brings *Tertul. Cyp. Arnobius, Lactantius, Ambroſe*. Of the Greeks, *Juſtin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Macarius, Athanaſius*, &c. yea, is bold to conclude, *Theſ.* 1. *nec ſecus qui ſenſerit quiſquam adduci poteſt*, To ſpare time in tranſcribing teſtimonies, that one of *Vincent Lyrin, in commonit. cap.* 34. may ſuffice for all, *quis unquam* (ſaid he) *ante profanum Pelagium tantam virtutem liberi præſumpſit arbitrii, & adhuc in bonis rebus per actus ſingulos adjuvandum neceſſariam Dei gratiam non putavit*. Yet *Jeſuit Molina in concord. cap.* 14. *art.* 13. *diſp.* 19. *memb.* 6. Says *a man may love God above all, and may overcome a grievous temptation without grace*, yea *Arriag.* in. 1. 2. *tom.* 2. *tract. de div. gr. diſp.* 41. *Sect.* 2. *n.* 1. Says *that a man in his fallen eſtate, has a Phyſical natural power without grace to keep the whole law*. So much indeed we cannot grant to *Pelagius*, both Scripture and

and Antiquity clearly contradicting Scripture, *Joh.* 15. 5. 2 *Cor.* 3. 5. And Antiquity, hence is that *Concil. Arauf.* 2. *can.* 22. *Nemo habet de ſuo niſi mendacium & peccatum.* I confeſs Jeſuits grant (for I would not wrong them) the neceſſity of grace, to acts which merit eternal Life, and thereby they endeavour to elude the Teſtimonies of Scripture, Fathers and Councils, aſſerting the neceſſity of ſpecial grace unto good Works. But as neither Scripture, nor Fathers, nor Ancient Councils do acknowledge that any Works of ours do properly merit eternal Life; So neither do they hold that a man without the ſpecial grace of God, can love God above all, and keep the whole Law. Secondly we likewiſe aſſert the powerful efficacy of grace in the converſion of ſinners, ſo that however it may be reſiſted, and oppoſed by corruption, yet never conquered, *Auguſt hæreſ.* 88. blamed *Pelagius quod gratiam non libero arbitrio præponeret, ſed infidel. calliditate ſupponeret*, that he did not ſubject free-will to grace, but contrary wiſe, by Heretical craftineſs, grace to free-will. Nay do not Jeſuits, who deny the efficacious and inexpugnable power of grace, ſubject grace to free-will? Is it not free-will with them which determins grace, and not grace which determins free-will, and put they it not in the option of free-will to make grace efficacious or inefficacious? Doth not *Auguſtin* frequently make this difference betwixt the grace of the ſtate of innocency, and the medicinal grace after the fall, that the grace of the ſtate of innocency was only *adjutorium ſine quo non*, or *poſſibilitatis*, grace which gave man power to do good, but medicinal grace is *adjutorium quo, & voluntatis*, grace which gives both to will and to do, as the Apoſtle phraſes it, *Phil.* 2. 13. here himſelf, *lib. de corrept & gra. cap.* 11. *prima gratia eſt, qua fit ut habeat homo juſtitiam ſi velit, ſecunda plus poteſt, quia fit ut velit* and *cap.* 12. by that, *auxilium quo ſubventum eſt infirmitati voluntatis humanæ, ut Divina gratia indeclinabiliter & inſuperabiliter ageretur.* What could a Proteſtant have ſaid more? See *c.* 14. and *l.* 1. *ad Simplic. q.* 2. and *lib.* 1. *contra duas Epiſt. Pelag. cap.* 19 and that this ſurely was a main point of difference betwixt the Orthodox and the *Semipelagians*, may appear by *Fauſtus Regienſis* a prime man of the *Semipelagian* party. *Anathema* (ſaid he) *ei qui dixerit illum qui periit non accepiſſe, ut ſalvus eſſe poſſet.* Hence *Hilary of Arles in Epiſt. ad Auguſt. de reliquiis Pelagii* reports, that they aſcribed

aſcribed to free-will, *ut velit, vel nolit admittere medicinam*, Hereupon *Concil. Araniſc. 2. can. 6.* decrees *per gratiam in nobis fieri ut credamus, & velimus*, and therefore ſurely prevailes over corruption, I know *Auſtin*, *Hilary*, *Proſper*, and *Fulgentius*, were poſterior to the firſt three Centuries, yet was it in their time that the *Pelagian* and *Semipelagian* controverſies concerning free-will were toſſed. And therefore a more accurate definition of the truth is to be exſpected from them, then from theſe who went before, *ſecurius loquuti ſunt ante exortum Pelagium*, and the rather having to do with *Manichees* and other Hereticks which denyed free-will altogether, and the queſtion being ſo difficult, that as *Auſtin* obſerved *lib. 3. de gratia Chriſti cont. Pelag. cap. 47.* and *lib. 4. cont. Jul. c. 3. when free-will is defended, grace ſeems to be denyed, and when grace is aſſerted, free-will ſeems to be taken away.* Dr. *Morton* in his appeal *lib. 2. cap. 10. Sect. 4.* has noted, that not only *Sixtus Senenſis* but alſo three of the Jeſuits ſociety *Tolet*, *Maldonat.* and *Perer us*, have cenſured ſundry of the Fathers, eſpecially in the Greek Church, as too much favouring the *Pelagian* intereſt in the matter of free-will, and therefore the leſs ſtreſs is to be laid upon their Authority in this thing.

Yet neither from the Fathers before *Pelagius* have Romaniſts the advantage which they boaſt of. All the teſtimonies which this Phamphleter filches from *Bell.* and many more, are vindicated by *Chemn. Tom. 3. Patrat. lib. 3. de lib. arb. cap. 16.* and by *Parens in Bell. Canig. lib. 5 de gra & lib. arb. cc. 25. & 26.* where they ſhew that theſe Fathers did only aſſert free-will as it ſtands in oppoſition to a fatal, or ſtoical, or ſimply natural neceſſity, which we likewiſe aſſert, but not in oppoſition to the neceſſity and efficacy of the grace of God, elſe they ſhould have *Pelagianized.* Only here I muſt remember him, that his baſtard Religion muſt be ſupported by baſtard teſtimonies of Fathers; Might he not have Learned that *Clements recognitions* are ſpurious from their own *Sixtus Senenſis lib. 2. Clemens* from *Bel. lib. 2. de pontif. cap. 2.* and from *Barron. Tom. 2. ad ann. 102. Num. 22.*

Doth not the world know how their Jeſuitical Doctrin of free-will is oppugned by a famous party of their own Church, not only by the *Janſenits*, but alſo by *Dominicans*, and *Thomiſts*? And dare the Jeſuited party call *Dominicans* and *Thomiſts* Here-

ticks, do we aſcribe leſs liberty to the will of man then they? Had their pretended Infallible judge dared to paſs a ſentence in this matter? How then dare he charge any with Hereſie in this matter till the definition of an infallible Judge be interpoſed? Or was it any wonder that *Innocent* the Tenth, who by the inſtigation of Jeſuites condemned the five *Janſenian* Propoſitions, ſhould Anathematize Truth for Hereſie, ſeeing he profeſſed of himſelf *Jo non ſon Theologo.* I ſhut up this diſcourſe of Free-will with *Auſtin lib. de dono perſever. cap. 6. Tutiores vivimus, ſi totum Deo damus, non autem nos illi ex parte, & nobis ex parte committimus, quod ipſe ſenſit venerabilis Martyr Cyprianus*; Its more ſafe to us to attribute no part to our ſelves, but to aſcribe all unto grace, which was the Doctrine of the bleſſed Martyr *Cyprian.*

From this alſo a Retortion might be deduced againſt Jeſuited Popery, ſeeing it manifeſtly *Pelagianizes* in the matter of Free-will, which was not done by the ancient Catholick Church.

SECT. IX.

A Ninth Inſtance of Novelty concerning Merits, examined and Retorted.

THe Pamphleter in his Ninth Inſtance, ſaith, *That Proteſtants deny the Merit of good Works.* But firſt ought not he to have told what he meant by Merit of good Works, whither with *Vaſquez in* 1. 2. *Diſp.*214. *cap.*5. That good works are condignly meritorious of Eternal life, *Tantum ratione operis*, without any regard to the promiſe or divine acceptation, or whither with *Bell. lib.* 5. *de juſtif. cap.* 17. he hold them meritorious, *& ratione operis & pacti*, both in regard of Gods Promiſe, and of the work it ſelf conjunctly, yet ſo as the work be equal to the reward; or whither they be meritorious, *Tantum ratione pacti*, in regard of the free promiſe of God only, for which *Bell.* cites *Scotus* and *Vega.* In this laſt ſenſe. The Proteſtant Churches have been ſo far from condemning merit, that the *Auguſtan confeſſion Art.* 20. *de bonis operibus*, and *confeſſ. of Wittemberg tit. de bonis operibus*, have not abhorred from the word merit. If he meant in either of the two former ſenſes, he could not condemn us as Hereticks, without condeming *Scotus* and *Vega*, yea many more

Romiſh

Romiſh Doctors cited by *Will. Forbes lib. 5. juſtif. cap. 4.* and beſides, he ſhould have proved that Fathers uſed the word Merit in that ſenſe. But why ſhould I blame this Pamphleter for not ſtating this queſtion more clearly, when their Infallible judge durſt not doe it? Though the *Council of Trent Seſſ. 6. Can. 32.* have anathematized them that deny good works, *vere mereri, truly to merit life eternall*; yet by reaſon of the differences of opinion among themſelves, durſt not define wherein the nature of that merit ſtood? O goodly Oracles, which every one may expound to his own ſenſe!

But Secondly, the Phamphleter cites three Fathers, *Ignatius, Juſtin, and Cyprian*, yet none of them favour merit in a Popiſh ſenſe, that is, either in *Vaſq.* or *Bellarmines* ſenſe: Excellently doth *Caſſander in Hymnis, Eccleſ. ad verba Hymni, nocte ſurgentes*, expound the ſenſe of this word *Merit* in ancient Fathers, *Vocabulum merendi* (ſaith he) *apud veteres Eccleſiaſticos Scriptores, fere idem valet, quod conſequi, ſeu aptum idoneumque fieri ad conſequendum, id quod inter cætera ex uno Cypriani loco apparet. Nam quod Paulus inquit*, 1 Tim. 1. ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο ἠλεήθην, *quod vulgo legitur miſericordiam conſequutus ſum, id Cyprianus, ad jubajanum legit miſericordiam meruit.* Though this might ſuffice to vindicate all the Teſtimonies of Ancients alleadged by Romaniſts in this matter, yet I muſt add, that they are eſpecially injurious to Greek Fathers, ſuch as *Ignatius* and *Juſtin Martyr, &c.* for in all their writings, there is no word exactly correſpondent to the word *Merit*, in the ſtrict notion thereof. The word in *Ignatius*, which Romaniſts render, to merit, or win God, is, ἐπιτυχεῖν, which ſignifies to attain. That of *Juſtin Martyr Apol. 2.* That men by their Merits ſhall live with God, is, τῆς μετ' αὐτοῦ διαγωγῆς κληρουχῆσαι, that is, are accounted worthy of his converſation, or to live with him. How we are accounted worthy, is excellently expreſſed by *Bernard, de Dedic. Eccleſ. Serm. 5. Illius dignatione non noſtra dignitate*, *Cyprian* indeed uſeth the word *Merit* as do many of the Latin Fathers, but in that innocent ſenſe which *Caſſander* proves out of *Cyprian*, and ſo *Bell. lib. 1. de lib. arb. c. 14.* confeſſes that every good work is *Meritum.*

But Thirdly, on the contrary, Popiſh Merit in *Vaſq.* or *Bell.* ſenſe might be diſproved by infinite Teſtimonies of Antiquity, as from *Origen* in *Rom. 4.* The attaining of the inheritance is *gratiæ, non debiti*, yea as *Auſtin, Pſal. 94. Si vellet pro meritis agere,*

non inveniret niſi quos damnaret, that is, if he would deal with us according to our Merits, he ſhould find none but thoſe whom he would condemn. In ſo much that the Author of the *Tractat. de prædeſt. & gratia, cap.* 10. which is added to the cloſe of *Auguſtin Tom.* 7. ſays, *Beatitudo alterius vitæ nullis humanis meritis redditur, ſed Dei donantis gratia largiente donatur*; Yea, many Schoolmen have been aſhamed of that preſumptuous Doctrine of Merit, of whom a large Catalogue may be had in *Davenant, de juſtif. actual & hab. cap.* 59. and in Dr. *Will. Forbes, lib.* 5. *de juſtif. cap.* 4.

So that this Ninth Inſtance of Novelty may likewiſe be inverted againſt Romaniſts, for the preſent Romiſh Religion maintains the proper Merit of good works, which the ancient Catholick Church did not.

SECT. X.

A Tenth Inſtance of Novelty, concerning a perfect keeping of the Commands, Examined and Retorted.

THe Pamphleter in his Tenth and laſt Inſtance, ſaith, That Proteſtants deny a poſſibility of keeping the Commandments. As he begins, ſo he cloſes, ſtill hudling up queſtions in general and ambiguous terms. We do not abſolutely deny a poſſibility of keeping the Commandments. It was poſſible for *Adam* to keep them perfectly, and ſhould have been poſſible for us, had he perſevered in a ſtate of Integrity. Yea, Believers through Grace may, and do keep the Commandments of God, with an Evangelical perfection. The ſupervenient impoſſibility to keep the Law perfectly without all ſin, under which we now labour, is accidental, through our corruption, and poſterior to the obligation of the Law. And this is clearly aſſerted in the Scriptures, *Rom.* 8. 3. *ἀδυνατὸν τοῦ νόμου, That which the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the fleſh*; And verſe 8. *That they are in the fleſh, cannot pleaſe God*, John 12. 39. *They could not Believe.*

Nay, the Pamphleter, by this Inſtance, convicts himſelf of the old *Pelagian* Hereſie; this was one of the Errors of the *Pelagians*, that men in this life might keep the Law perfectly without ſin, as is held out by *Hierom in his Dialogue betwixt Atticus and Critobulus*

Critobulus Cont. Pelag. lib. 1, *and lib.* 3. and is expreſly condemned by Fathers, both before and after *Pelagius*, by *Juſtin Martyr, dial. cum Tryph. edit. comm. pag.* 252. *ἐδὲ δυνᾶται πᾶσα ἁμαρτία*, by *Cyprian de Orat. Dom.* we are taught that we ſin daily, being commanded daily to pray for forgiveneſs of Sin. Should I tranſcribe all which might be brought from *Heron. Austin, &c.* after the ſtating of the *Pelagian* Controverſy, I might fill a Volumn. Hence *Hier. lib.* 1. *adver. Pelag. hæc est hominis vera ſapientia ſe noſſe imperfectum*, and in c. p. 4. *ad Caſat. nemo potest explere legem & cuncta facere quæ juſta ſunt.* And *Auguſt. Epiſt.* 200. *ad Aſellicum, lex data est non concupiſces, hoc poſuit non quod hic valeamus, ſed ad quod proficiendo tendamus.*

As for that old *Pelagian* objection, *That God commands nothing which is Impoſſible. Anſwer*, nothing which is in it ſelf, and ſimply impoſſible, its granted. Nothing which we accidentally render impoſſible to our ſelves, its denyed. Are not they who are judicially obſtured, who ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, bound to Repent, are not Devils bound not to Sin, will you therefore conclude that all theſe have ſtrength or grace ſufficient to keep the Law of God? But let *Austin de Perfect. Juſtit. cap.* 6 *ratioc.* 13. Anſwer this objection, as moved of old by *Celeſtius the Pelagian, Ideo eſſe culpam hominis, quod non eſt ſine peccato, quia ſola hominis voluntate eſt, ut ad istam neceſſitatem veniret.*

Thus have I run through the Pamphleters 10. Inſtances, and now let him reflect upon his Imaginary Triumph, *pag.* 153. 154. wherein he inſults over Proteſtants as if they lay proſtrate at the feet of this Conqueror, and expoſes them to the ludibry of the world, as diſowning Fathers, charging them with Errors, and maintaining a Religion flatly oppoſite to the Doctrin of Fathers, but I hope this may be a document to him, henceforth to ſtudy ſo much ſobriety, as not to ſound the Triumph before the Victory.

The First APPENDIX to CHAP. VII.

Containing another Decad of Romish *Novelties in Religion.*

BEfore I desist from this enquiry after Romish Novelties, the Adversary must be advertised, that though he had acquainted the Church of *Rome* in the Ten foregoing Instances (in which I hope his failour by this time may be manifest) yet had he not done his work. For she hath Innovated grosly in many other particulars, whereof I shall present here another Decad, which the Catholick Church of the first Three Ages did never approve.

Instance First, the present Romish Church holds the Books of *Maccabees, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, Baruch, Wisdom, for Canonical Scriptures, and Anathematizes them who do otherwise.* So the *Council of Trent, Sess.* 4. *Decret.* 1. But the Church in the first three Ages held no such thing, as is evident from the Catalogues of *Melito, in Euseb. Hist. lib.* 5. *cap.* 24. Of *Origen* in *Euseb. lib.* 6. *c.* 25. Of *Athan. in Synopsi.* and of the Council of *Laodicea Can.* 59. Of *Hierom in Prol. gal.* or *præfat. ad lib. reg.* and *Prol. in lib. Solom. ad Paul. & Eustoch.* and *Prol. in lib. Sol. ad Cyromat. & Heliod.* yea, *Bell. lib.* 1. *de verb. Dei cap.* 10. Is not only constrained to yield us *Hierom*, but also *cap.* 20. grants that *Melito, Epiph. Ruffinus*, and *Hilary* do follow the Jewish Church in the Canon of Scripture. Now sure it is that the Jewish Church did never acknowledge the forecited Books for Authentick Scriptures. I appeal all the Antiquaries of *Rome* to bring me one evidence from the first three Centuries of their *Trent* Canon of Scriptures. This was objected by me to Mr. *Dempster, pag.* 8. *pag.* 171. but yet I am waiting a Reply.

The greatest Pretext for the Ancient Pedigree of the *Trent* Canon, including the forecited Apocriphal Books, is, that of

Becan

Becan the Jesuite, *In Compend. Manual. Controv. lib. 1. cap. 1. qu. 1. Sect. 2. That the Council of* Trent *received is from Pope* Eugenius 4. *in the Council of* Florence, *and* Eugenius *from Pope* Gelasius *in a Roman Council of his time,* Gelasius *from* Augustine, Augustine *from the Third Council of* Carthage, *and the Council of* Carthage *from* Innocent *the First, who saith,* Becan *lived Anno* 402.

But this is such a Fallacious Story, as ambitious men of base Extract are apt to forge to make their descent to be esteemed honourable; For first, it's so noturly evident and proven by so many, that these late meetings at *Trent* and *Florence* were no legitimate General Councils, that I should hold it lost time to insist in probation thereof. Secondly, that Canon of Scripture attributed to the Council of *Florence*, seems to be suppositious, seeing there is no mention of it, either in the History of that Council written by *Silvester Sguropulus*, who was present thereat or in the Tomes of the Councils, set forth by the Authority of Pope *Paul* 5. *Anno* 1612. or in the Edition of *Binius*, *Anno* 1618. Yea, Dr. *Cosin* in his Scholastical History, *cap.* 16. *Num.* 159. and 160. observes that it is not to be found in any of the Editions of the large Tomes of the Councils by *Pet. Crab.* &c. The first mention we have thereof being in *Caranza*'s Epitome of the Councils. It is a strong suspition of Forgery, when more is in the Epitome, then in the large Volums of the Councils. Nay further, that whole instruction to the *Armenians*, which is said to be given by Pope *Eugenius* 4. in the Council of *Florence*, whereof *Caranza* makes his Catalogue of the Books of Scripture, to be one Article, is likewise questioned, seeing it is dated in the Year 1439. 10. *Kal. December*, five months after the dissolution of the Council, for it had been dissolved in the Month of *July* proceeding. Thirdly, its a large leap which *Becan* makes from *Eugenius* and the Council of *Florence* unto *Gelasius* the first, and his Roman Council, near about a 1000. years, this is a great hiatus and gape in the Pedegree. Fourthly, that Decree of *Gelasius* with his Roman Council of Seventy Bishops, as also *Innocent* the first his Decretal to *Exuperius*, looks to be suppositious, and the rather, seeing there was no mention of them till *Isidorus Mercator* began to vent his Sophistical wares 300. years after the Death of *Gelasius*, and 400 after the Death of *Innocentius*. Who would see more to prove the Forgery of both, may peruse Dr. *Cosins* Scholast. Hist. of the Canon of the Scripture, *Sect.* 83. 86, 87.

86, 87. Fifthly, I have already ſhewed *cap.* 3. *Fol.* 1. that neither *Auſtin*, nor the Council of *Carthage*, ever meant that theſe Books were ſtrictly Canonical, that is, given by Divine inſpiration to be a publick rule to the Church, for confirming Articles of Faith, though they might be read in the Church, for a more ample inſtruction how to lead a regular courſe of Life. *Auſtin lib.* 18. *de civ. dei cap.* 36. expreſly diſtinguiſhes the Books of *Maccabees*, from theſe that are ſtrictly canonical. Nor is there mention of the *Maccabees* in that Canon of *Carthage*, either as it is ſet down in the Greek Code, or in the collection made by *Creſconius*, not to ſpeak of the ſcruples that are raiſed concerning the reality of that Canon, or Council by which it was made, of which I leave the Reader to Dr. *Coſins Hiſt. S. B.* 82. But ſixthly, admitting *Innocents decretals* and *Gelaſius decree*, and the Canon of *Carthage* to be real, yet all ſtill within the fifth Century, for *Innocent* whom *Becan* ſets, in the firſt place is ſaid to have lived *Anno* 402. And *Gelaſius* was in the end of that Century, about the Year 494. and ſo falls ſhort of the firſt three ages. I add ſeventhly and laſtly, that ſure it is that neither by *Innocent*, nor *Gelaſius*, nor the Council of *Carthage*, yea, nor by the Council of *Florence* could theſe Books be declared to be ſtrictly and properly Canonical for moſt eminent Doctors in the Roman Church, who could not be ignorant what theſe Councils and Popes had defined, denyed either all, or ſome of them to be Canonical, ſuch as *Lyranus*, *Antoninus*, *Abulenſis*, *Cajetan*, &c. When *Melchior Canus* had objected theſe Authors to himſelf *lib.* 2. *cap.* 10. he Anſwers *cap.* 11. *ad extrema*, *illos ignorantiâ Laborâſſe*, Where *Melchior Canus* brings on himſelf the ſuſpicion of diſ-ingenuity, and of deſperateneſs on his cauſe, when he hath no other evaſion, but to ſay that the moſt eminent Doctors in the Church of *Rome* underſtand not what was defined to be Canonical Scripture by the Church. By all which it may appear, that juſtly Learned Proteſtants have concluded, that the preſent Romiſh Canon was ſo far from being acknowledged by the Ancient Church, that it was never defined as an Article of Faith until the late *Trent* Co venticle.

Here it might make a good Problem, why they of the Roman Church who ſo much undervalue the Scripture are ſo vehement to have the *Apocrypha* Books enrolled in the Scripture-Canon? But judicious Dr. *Don Serm.* 73. hath diſcloſed the

the Myſtery, *viz.* the deſign of Romaniſts being, to undervalue Scripture, that they may overvalue their Traditions and ſentences of their viſible judge, therefore they put the name of Scripture upon Books of a lower value, that the unworthineſs of theſe additional Books may caſt a diminution upon the Books which truely are Canonical, when all are made alike. A Stratagem forſooth well becoming the man of ſin.

Inſtance ſecond the *Council of Trent ſeſs.* 4. *decret* 2. hath Authorized *the vulgar Latin verſion of the Bible to the authentique rule of Faith, paſſing by the Originals of the Hebrew and Greek*, the like cannot be pretended to be done by the Church in the firſt three Centuries. Romaniſts will have much a do to prove that the vulgar Latin, as now ſet forth by *Clement* the eighth, was extant in theſe three Centuries. Sure I am that the Ancient Fathers, even they who flouriſhed after the third Century, were ſo far from teaching that the Hebrew Text of the Old Teſtament, and Greek of the New, were to be corrected by this Latin verſion, that they held all verſions were to be corrected by the Original. Take for all *Hieron Epiſt. ad Suniam & Fretelam* and *Auguſt. lib.* 2. *de Doctrin. Chriſt*, *cap.* 15.

Inſtance third the *Council of Trent ſeſs.* 22. *cap.* 8. and *Can.* 9. *declares it not to be expedient, that the publick worſhip of God ſhould be performed in a Language known to the multitude, and anathematizes them who teach otherwiſe.* So taught not the Chriſtian Church of the firſt three ages, as hath oft been demonſtrated by our Divines from *Orig. lib.* 8. *Cont. Celſum. Juſtin apol.* 2. *Tertul. Apol.* 39. *Clemens Alex. Strom. lib.* 7. *Chryſ. Baſil. Auſtin.* At preſent let that of *Origen* ſuffice *lib.* 8. *contra Celſum*, every Nation ſaith he, Prays to God in their own proper Language. Yea the more ingenuous among Romaniſts confeſs ſo much. Hence *Lyranus in* 1 *Cor.* 14. *in primitiva Eccleſia benedictiones, & cætera omnia fiebant in Lingua vulgari.* So alſo *Caſſander in Liturg. cap.*28. Yea, *Bell.* himſelf *lib.* 2 *de verb dei cap.* 16. from *Juſtin Martyr. Chryſoſt. Cyp.* and *Hieron* acknowledges that in the primitive Church the whole multitude joyned in the publick ſervices ſaying, *Amen*, which ſuppoſes, they underſtood, what was ſaid. And a little after he ſaith, that in proceſs of time that cuſtom was changed, and a Clerk was ſubſtituted to ſay *Amen*, in name

of the People. Conſequently by *Bellarmins* confeſſion the *Roman* Church in this particular hath innovated. And of that Clerk alſo *Suarez. in* 3. *part. tom.* 3. *q.* 83. *art.* 4. *diſp.* 83. *ſect.* 1. Is not aſhamed to ſay, *nunc non eſt neceſſe, ut miniſter linguam intelligat in qua miſſa dicitur*, that now it is not neceſſary that the Miniſter underſtand the Language wherein *Maſs* is ſaid. *Cajetan* is better adviſed, who in 1 *Cor.* 14. confeſſes *it were for more edification, that the worſhip were performed in a known tongue.* So doth *Aquinas in* 1 *Cor.* 14. and *Caſſander in defenſ. offic. pii. viri. Pag.* 141. wiſhes *that according to the Apoſtles command, and practice of the Ancient Church Gods worſhip were performed in a known tongue.* So far is this worſhipping of God without underſtanding, now practiſed and taught by the *Romiſh* Church from that reaſonable ſervice which God requires *Rom.* 12. 1. that *Auſtin expoſit* 2. *in Pſal.* 18. compares it to the chattering of Parrots, and Crows. and *lib.* 4 *de Doct. Chriſti. cap.* 10. *quid prodeſt* (ſaith he) *locutionum integritas, quam non ſequitur intellectus audientis*, yea, *in decret. Greg.* 9. *lib.* 1. *tit.* 31. *de offic. jud. ord. cap.* 14. Its ordained, *that Cities where are people of different Languages, men be provided to celebrate Divine ſervice according to the diverſity of Languages* and *Juſtiniſan in Novel.* 123. Statutes *that holy things be celebrated with a loud and diſtinct voice, that the hearts of the hearers, may be raiſed up to the greater devotion*, which could not be, if then the worſhip had not been performed in an intelligible Language. In the *Roman Pontifical* Readers are commanded *lectiones ſacras diſtincte, & aperte ad intelligentiam & ædificationem fidelium proferre.* It is as eaſie therefore to reconcile Adultery with the Seventh Commandement, as the preſent way of the Romiſh Church, either with Scripture, or Antiquity.

Its true in many places of the Weſt, publick worſhip was performed in Latin, but its as true that the Latin Tongue was then generally underſtood, by reaſon of the Roman Colonies. Yet Romaniſts want not ſome preſidents for their barbarous worſhip, ſuch as the Hereticks called *Oſſeni in Epiphanius hæreſ.* 19. and the *Hieraclionitæ in Auſtin hæreſ.* 16. who taught to pray with obſcure word. Neither do we envy them the example of *Turks*, who Read their ſervice in the *Arabick*, of which the people underſtand nothing, or of the modern *Jews*, who Read *Hebrew* in their Synagogues, which alſo the multitude do but rarely underſtand.

Inſtance

Inſtance fourth the Romiſh Church in the publick and Ordinary adminiſtration of the Euchariſt *do with draw the Cup from the people, ſo the Council of* Trent *ſeſſ.* 22. *can.* 1. 2. *and the Council of Conſtance ſeſſ.* 13. *in Coranza's epitome, præcipimus ſub pœna Excommunicationis, quod nullus Presbiter communicet populum ſub utraq; ſpecie panis & vini*, that is, we command under pain of Excommunication, that no presbiter give the Communion to the people under both kinds. This is certainly repugnant to the practice of the Ancient Church, for the Sanctified Bread and Wine was given ἑκατέρου to every one who was preſent ſaith *Juſtin Martyr Apol.* 2. *Cyp. Epiſt.* 63. expreſly makes mention of the Sanctifying of the Cup, and giving it to the people, *& plebi miniſtrando. Chryſoſt. homil.* 18. *in* 2. *Epiſt. ad Cor.* ſaith. *there is no difference betwixt paſtor and people, as to communicating, ſeeing the ſame body, and the ſame cup is given to both*, Yea, Pope *Gelaſius in Gratian de conſecrat. diſt.* 2. *cap. comperimus*, made that decree, *ut integra recipiant, aut ab integris arceantur.* Who pleaſe may find an army of Teſtimonies to this purpoſe in *Chamier tom.* 4. *lib.* 8. *cap.* 9. What need I more, the thing being acknowledged by adverſaries themſelves. As *Alphonſus a Caſtro de hæreſ. tit. Euchariſtia hæreſ.* 12. *Caſſander in Conſult art.* 22. *Barneſ. in Catbol. Rom. Pacifico. Sect.* 7. *Picherel de Miſſa cap.* 4. Yea, *Caſſander* ſaith, *this was not only the way of the Catholick Church to give it under both kinds, but alſo the Roman above the ſpace of a* 1000 *Years.*

This is another of the Romiſh Novelties, I had objected to Mr. *Dempſter Pap.* 8. *Pag.* 170. and yet remains unanſwered. Only this Pamphleter *Pag.* 147. when he had been ſpeaking of the preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament. ſneakingly inſinuates ſome inſignificant whiſpers, to fetch ſome colour from antiquity *for their mutilation of the Sacrament becauſe anciently its ſaid to be given to Infants, and to the Sick, and to have been carried to private Houſes, yea over Sea, and for* this laſt he cites *Euſeb. lib.* 5. *Hiſt.* without deſignation of any Chapter. But all theſe Inſtances (which he hath taken out of *H. T's. Manual art.* 12.) are either falſe or impertinent. For firſt ſome of theſe things are diſſallowed by the preſent Romiſh Church, *viz. the giving of the Euchariſt to Infants*, by the Council of *Trent ſeſſ.* 21. *can.* 3. and the ſending it to abſents is prohibited by the Council of *Cæſar Auguſt can* 3. about the Year 381. and by the firſt Council

of *Toledo can.* 14. Anno 400. as is acknowledged by *Durantus, de rit Eccleſ. lib.* 1. *cap.* 16. Secondly the Queſtion betwixt Romaniſts and us, is about the *publick and ordinary celebration of the Sacrament to adult perſons*, wherein the preſent Romiſh Church commands it to be given under on *ſpecies, viz.*, of *bread*, but all the Inſtances, yea and all that ever I could read brought by any Romaniſt, are of ſome extraordinary caſes of *Sickneſs, Abſence, Perſecution*, &c. But none of the publick ordinary celebration of the Sacrament. How far in extraordinary caſes Proteſtants have yeelded, Dr. *Will. Forbes lib.* 2. *de commun. ſub utraque ſpecie cap.* 1. hath given an account from *Bucer*, Dr. *Andrews*, *Caſaubon* and *Spalat.* Thirdly, the preſent Romiſh Church proceed further and prohibit *the giving of the cup to the people under pain of Excommunication*, as I ſhew from *Caranza*, but no Romaniſt ever undertook to ſhew a preſident for ſuch a prohibition, from Antiquity. Fourthly its falſely affirmed by the Pamphleter, *that Denys Cyprian Tertul. and Euſeb. ſay that when the Eucharift was given to Infants, Sick, or abſent perſons, reſtriction was made to one kind only, far leſs to the ſpecies of Bread alone.* That it was given to Infants under both kinds, *Chamier tom.* 4. *lib.* 9. *cap.* 3. proves from *Auſtin Epiſt.* 107. *Cyprian and Genadius.* Yea, *Bell.* does not alledge that the bread only was given to Infants, but the Cup. The truth is they ſhould have had neither, but ſurely they got both. As for the Sick and abſent. *Juſtin Martyr apol.* 2. teſtifies that both the Bread and Wine were carried to them, and *Hierom Epiſt.* 4. ſays of *Exuperius* that he carried not only *Corpus Chriſti in canistro vimineo*, but alſo *ſanguinem in vitro*, that is, Chriſts blood in a Glaſs, *Greg. Nazianz. orat.* 11. reports that his Siſter *Gorgonia* preſerved the Symbols both of Chriſts body and blood, and therefore it was too great preſumption in the Pamphleter to ſay *that this could not be done but under one kind.* I know not what he means by his citation from *Euſeb. lib.* 5. unleſs he point at the caſe of *Serapion*, but then he ſhould have ſaid *lib.* 6. nor does it make any thing for him, for the Bread was dipt into the Wine, and ſo put into *Serapions* mouth Dr. *Francis White* in his reply to Jeſuit *Fiſher point* 7. *Pag.* 503. brings in the Council of *Tours*, *Burchardus* and *Ivo* giving this Reaſon of that kind of practice, *ut veraciter presbiter dicere poſſit, corpus & ſanguis domini Jeſu Chriſti tibi proſit ad vitam æternam.*

If

If any ask, *what then the communion of Laicks is*, whereof Ancients as *Cyprian* the Councils of *Sardica* and *Eliberis*, &c. make mention. *Anſw.* It was no communion under one kind as *Bell.* falſly, and without any ground would have it, and ſo much *Lorinus* the Jeſuit *in Act.* 2. and *Durantus de ritib. Eccleſ. lib.* 2. *cap.* 55. are conſtrained to acknowledge, for certain it is that the people got the Sacrament in thoſe days under both kinds, and beſides, Its clear that Miniſters, becauſe of Mal-behaviour were then reſtricted to the communion of Laicks. But in the Roman Church prieſts themſelves, when they do not conſecrate, how unblameably ſo ever they walk, receive but under one kind. The truth therefore is, as our Learned *Chamier tom* 4. *lib.* 9. *cap.* 3. doth ſolidly prove from *Cyprian*, *Balſamon*, &c. that phraſe was taken from the degrees of Church Cenſurs upon office bearers in the Church. for ſometime they were both depoſed from their office, and Excommunicated from the Church, and conſequently might not partake of the Euchariſt, at other time they were only depoſed *ab officio*, and ſo not reckoned among the Clergy, yet not Excommunicated, and ſo were admitted ad λαϊκων κοινωνιαν to communicate with the people of God. With this diſtinction from thoſe of the Clergy ſaith, *Durantus loc. cit.* that they received the Sacrament *extra cancellos & non in ſacrationi loco.*

Inſtance fifth, the preſent Roman Church *allows of private communions, wherein the prieſt alone partakes of the conſecrated elements, and none elſe, and anathematizes them who judge that practice unlawful, ſo the Council of Trent ſeſſ.* 22. *can.* 8. but this is certainly repugnant to the inſtitution of Chriſt, and to the practice of the Ancient Church, as is demonſtrated largly by *Chamier*, *tom.* 4. *lib.* 7. *cap.* 17. 18. 19. from the Ancient Liturgies, Canons and Councils, and ſuffrages of Fathers, yea this matter is ſo clear that their own Authors cannot but acknowledge it, as *Caſſander in Conſult. art.* 24. where alſo he cites *Odo Cameracenſis*, *Walafridus*, *Strabo*, *Micrologus*, *Heſſmeinterus*, &c. teſtifying the ſame. Sure either theſe ſolitary *Maſſes* were not in uſe at the compounding of the Roman *Miſſal*, or their *Miſſal* is in many things ridiculous, as when the prieſt ſaith, *dominus vobiſcum*, *ſurſum corda*, *gratias agamus domino Deo noſtro*, *habete vinculum pacis quod ſumpſimus Domine*, all which expreſſions, and many more, import that there were more preſent to partake

partake of the Sacrament, then the Prieſt. Muſt not Romaniſts be deſtitute of Patrociny from Antiquity, when *Bell. lib. 2. de Miſſa cap. 9. Sect. 3. Probatur*, confeſſes, *nuſquam expreſſe legimus à veteribus oblatum ſacrificium ſine communione alicujus, vel aliquorum præter Sacerdotem*, *Joannes Heſſmeſterus apud Caſſand. loc. cit.* wonders how the cuſtome of theſe ſolitary *Maſſes* came up.

If any do obiect *the reſervation of the Sacrament in primitive times.* Anſw. They make nothing for theſe ſolitary communions of the prieſt alone. The Miniſter had ever others preſent who did partake with him, as appears by all the Ancient *Liturgies*, yea, by the Roman *Miſſal*, neither were thoſe reſervations for ſuch ends as now they are uſed in the Roman Church, *viz.*, for a Pompous circumgeſtation and adoration, but to be received by Sick and abſent perſons, who were reputed as a part of that congregation, which did partake with the Miniſter at the firſt conſecration. Though the carying home of the Sacrament to be eaten apart, be a far different caſe from that now under debate, yet *Bell. lib. 4. de Euch. cap. 5. ad tertiam*, cannot deny, but that alſo was long ago abrogated by the Council of *Cæſar Auguſta*, and the firſt of *Toledo.*

Inſtance ſixth the preſent Roman Church holds *the abſolute neceſſity of confeſſing to a Prieſt, all the mortal ſins that we can remember, and that, jure Divino, by a Divine ordinance. So the Council of Trent ſeſſ. 14. cap. 5.* and *can 6. 7.* Thus did not the primitive Church as is acknowledged by *Barneſ. the Benedictin in Catbol. Rom. Pacif. Sect. 8.* and for it cites the *Greek Church*, *Gratian* and the *Gloſſator*, the *Abbot of Parnormo*, *Scotus*, *Durand*, *Modina*, *Beatus Rhenanus*, *Cajetan Eraſmus.* and in further confirmation, brings of Ancients *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Cyril of Alexandria.* and many Teſtimonies of *Chryſoſt.* Yet Proteſtants do not altogether condemne the confeſſion of ſecret ſins to a judicious perſon, far leſs to a faithful Miniſter, as may be ſeen *in Calvin lib. 3. inſtit. cap. 4. Sect. 12. 13.* and *Chemnit. examin. Concil. Trid. Part 2 cap. 5. de pœnit.* and is confeſſed by *Bell. lib. de pœnit. cap. 1.* But that we condemn in the Romiſh Church is, that contrary to the Ancient Catholick Church ſhe has impoſed the abſolute neceſſity to Salvation, of confeſſing all mortal ſins, ſo far as we can remember, and that by a *jus divinum*,

a preſident for this will not be found in the firſt three Centuries, nor much lower, in ſo much that *Gratian part* 2. *cauſ.* 33. *q.* 3. *cap.* 34. ſays *ore tacente veniam conſequi poſſumus.* Though at firſt, publick confeſſion was only injoyned to be of publick offences, yet others perceiving what benefits redounded to penitents thereby, and finding their own conſciences burdened with the like ſins, which being carryed in ſecrecy were not Subject to the cenſures of the Church, to the end they might obtain the like conſolation, and quiet of mind, did voluntarily ſubmit themſelves to the Churches diſcipline, and undergo the burden of publick confeſſion, and Canonical cenſures. Hereoff the Learned *Uſſer* gives an large account in his anſwer to the Jeſuits challenge, *cap.* 4. and proves it from *Origen homil.* 2. *in pſ* 37. *Tertul. lib. de penit. cap.* 9. *Cyprian ſerm. de lapſis. Ambroſ. lib.* 1. *de penit cap.* 16. A further account is given of the ſame in another Learned, but *anonymous tractat* of Confeſſion. Entituled, *Sin dismantled, cap.* 7. *Sect.* 2. and before them both in *Chemnitius, examin. Concil Trid. part* 4. *de indulg. cap.* 4. *Pag.* 724. *edit Genev.* 1641. And that the publication of theſe ſecret faults might be done to the more edification, Some prudent Miniſter was firſt acquainted therewith, by whoſe direction the delinquent might underſtand what ſins were fit to be brought to the publick notice of the Church, and in what manner the confeſſion was to be performed. Hence *Origen homil.* 2. *in Pſal* 37. is ſo earneſt in adviſing to make choyce of a skilful Phyſician, to whom to diſcloſe griefs of this kind. But about the time of the *Decian* preſecution, it was ordained that in every Church on diſcreet Miniſter ſhould be appointed to receive the confeſſions of thoſe, who relapſed into ſin after Baptiſm, and then the penitent had no more the choyce of his confeſſor. This is that addition which *Socrates* Notes to have been made to the penitential canon *lib.* 5. *Hiſt. cap.* 19. this was obſerved until the time of *Nectarius* Biſhop of Conſtantinople, who becauſe of a notorious treſpaſs of a deacon, to wipe of the Infamy from the Clergy, and to prevent the like Scandals, abrogated theſe private confeſſions. If *Nectarius*, *Chryſoſt.* and the Greek Church had looked upon this confeſſion, as appointed by a Divine ordinance, or abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, would they have abrogated it? Or had the Roman Church then been

of

of the now *Trent* Faith, would they not have expoſtulated with the Greek Church on this account? How much are Romaniſts netled with this argument when *Bell. lib. 3. de pœnit. cap. 14.* to evite the dint of it, accuſes *Sozomen* and *Socrates* the Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtorians, as Lyars, though he have no ground to convict them in that matter, yea they are aſſoyled by his fellow Jeſuit *Suarez in partem 3. tom. 4. diſp. 17. Sect 2. Num. 31.* and therefore being affraid, that this ſhift would not prove ſufficient, he further alleadges that *Nectarius* abrogated only publick confeſſion, a moſt ludibrious fiction. When an Infamy was brought on the Clergy by a treſpaſs committed under the covert of ſecret confeſſions, had this been a way to wipe of the blot, or to prevent more evils of that kind, to ordain that thence forth there ſhould be no confeſſions but in ſecret? Certainly this would have increaſed the Infamy on the Clergy, and given further opportunities to theſe impure dalliances. But what need I more, when *Chryſoſt.* immediate ſucceſſor to *Nectarius* in perſuance of the ſtatute of *Nectarius*, is ſo full and frequent in preaching againſt the neceſſity of ſecret confeſſions, as *homil. 31. in heb. eum qui agit pœnitentiam nunquam oportet prodere peccatum, ſed Deum rogare ne ejus meminerit.* And *homil. de pœnit. & confeſſ. ſolus te Deus confitentem videat.* In ſo much that *F. Barneſ* ſpares not to ſay *Chryſoſtomus apertus eſt pro hac ſententiâ.* Who deſire a large confutation of the pretended neceſſity, Antiquity, or *jus divinum* of theſe ſecret confeſſions, together with the inextricable perplexities in which they involue the conſciences of poor people, and the moſt impious conſequences of them, as they are managed by Romaniſts. I remit them among others to Dr. *Taylour's diſſwaſive part 2. lib. 1. cap. 11.* and to the foreſaid *anonymous tractat. cap. 6.* and 7. For my purpoſe at preſent, It will be enough to advertiſe the Reader, that *Platina* the Popes ſecretary *in vita Zepherini* could find no higher riſe for the impoſed neceſſity of this confeſſion, then from *Innocent* the third about 1200. Yeares after Chriſt. Yea, *Barneſ. loc. cit.* thinks the impoſing of it as a *jus divinum*, no older then the Council of *Trent*, and for it has this argument becauſe in the Florentin Council the Roman Church was willing to make peace with the *Greeks*, albeit, *notorie perſiſtentes in hac ſententia*, they notoriouſly

notoriouſly perſiſted in that opinion, that there is no neceſſity of ſuch confeſſion.

Inſtance ſeventh, the preſent Roman Church maintaines *indulgences for the eaſe of Souls in Purgatory*, Yea, if we may credit *Bell. lib.* 1. *de indulg. cap.* 14. *Ibi in apud Catholicos res certiſſima & indubitata*, a moſt ſure and undoubted point, yet ſurely it was not known to antiquity, as I proved in my *paper fight againſt* Mr. *Demſter Pag.* 172. 173. and yet remaines unanſwered, and is acknowledged by Famous Romaniſts, *Roffenſis cont. Luth. art.* 18. *Alphonſus a Caſtro, lib.* 8 *de hæreſ. tit. indulg. Antoninus part.* 1. *Sum. tit.* 10. *cap.* 3. *Durand in* 4. *ſent. diſp.* 20. To whom now I add *Suarez tom.* 4. *in* 3. *part. diſp.* 49. *Sect.* 2. *Num.* 14. *nec movere debet quemquem*, (ſaith he) *quod apud antiquos Doctores Eccleſiæ Græcos & Latinos nulla inveniatur expreſſa mentio indulgentiarum*, Learned *Caſſander in Conſult. art.* 12 *Sect. de indulg.* aſſerts that the Ancient Church knew no indulgences, but relaxations from Canonical cenſurs impoſed by the Church on delinquents, in this Life. So alſo *Barneſ. in Cathol. Rom. pacif. Sect.* 9. where alſo he cites for it *Vicelius Cajetan* and *Caſſander*, *loc. cit.* breaths after the Reformation of the Church of *Rome* in this matter, but the mercats of Indulgences are ſo lucrative that ſuch propoſals cannot be heard. Its long ſince the *Germans* in their *Centum gravamina grav.* 3. complained that their Countrey was ſpoyled of Money, and that *inceſt*, *adulteries*, *murthers*, *perjuries*, and all manner of ſins were nouriſhed by the *Popes pardons*. I ſhall not take up time to reckon out the Religious works which they require for obtaining theſe pardons, as pilgrimages, viſiting ſuch a Chappel, ſtanding on Eaſter day at *Peters* Church door, when the Pope does ſolemnly paſs by, and bleſs the people, *&c.* Is it not ſtrange that the world ſhould be cheated with ſuch toyes. I will not trifle time, with their *Ave Maries*, and *Pater Noſters*, and being of ſuch a Society which they reward with ample indulgences. Bloody (I am ſure) was the *Bull of Jul.* 2. who (as Dr. *Taylour* has the relation, *diſſ. p.* 2. *lib.* 2. *Sect.* 1.) gave indulgences to him who meeting a *French-man*, or *Venetian ſhould kill him*. How contrary is this to the real Piety, as well, as to the diſcipline of the Ancient Church?

Inſtance eight, *The Popedome it ſelf is a bundle of innovations*; For firſt is not the *election of Popes by a conclave of Cardinals a*

meer Novelty. Were theſe creatures who go under the name of *Cardinals* inveſted with ſuch dignities, priviledges, power, and functions within the firſt three Centuries? *Azor.* the Jeſuit anxiouſly inquiring after their original *part.* 2. *Inſtit Moral. lib.* 4. *cap.* 1. *queſt.* 4. can bring their pedegree no higher then to Pope *Sylveſter* in the fourth Century. But they were nothing then like what they are now. For till *Boniface* the third obtained from *Phocas* the title of univerſal Biſhop, they were inferior to Biſhops, ſays *Pol. Virgil. de invent. lib.* 4. *cap.* 9. and *Bell.* confeſſes as much *lib.* 1. *de Cler. cap.* 16. the reſtraining of the election of Popes to *Cardinals*, was only done by Pope *Alexander* the third in 12. *cent.* ſays *Azor. loc. cit. cap.* 2. *q.* 2. and the ſame Jeſuit *ibid. cap.* 1. *q.* 3. confeſſes, the name office, dignity, number and priviledges of *Cardinals* to be only papal Inſtitutions, and not *juris Divini*, Yea, *Bell.* grants, *lib.* 1. *de cler. cap.* 16. *that its within thoſe ſix or ſeven hundred years, that neceſſity by little and little forced the* Pope *to leave of Epiſcopal Councils, and to rule all things by a Council of Cardinals.*

Secondly is not the *impropriating the power of convocating Synods to the* Pope *a manifeſt Novelty?* Were not the firſt four *Oecumenick Councils* convocated by the *Emperors*, the *Nicen by Conſtantin*, as is witneſſed by *Euſeb. lib.* 3. *de vita Conſtan. c.* 6. *Socrates Hiſt. lib.* 1. *cap.* 5. *Theod. lib.* 1. *cap.* 7. The *ſecond at* Conſtantinople *by Theodoſ. the elder*, ſee *Sozomen lib.* 7. *cap.* 7. *Socrates lib.* 5. *cap.* 8. The *third at Epheſus* by *Theodoſius the younger*, See *Evag. lib.* 1. *cap.* 3. and frequently the Council atteſts this in her Acts. The *fourth at Chalcedon* by *Marcianus*. So *Liberat in Breviar. cap.* 13. and the Council it ſelf, confeſſes the convocation to be *ex decreto pientiſſimorum imperatorum, Valentiniani & Marciani.* Its therefore untollerable impudency in *Bell. Barron. Azor.* and other Romaniſts to ſay that Emperors did only Petition the Biſhops of *Rome* to convocate Councils, nay on the contrary the Biſhops of *Rome* did Petition the Emperors. Did not Pope *Leo* make many inſtant and humble ſupplications to *Theodoſius* and *Marcianus* before the fourth general Council at *Chalcedon* was convocated? yea it could not be obtained at all, during the Life of *Theodoſius.* So clear is it, that anciently *Oecumenick Councils* were convocated by *Emperors*, that *Hieron in Apol.* 2. *adverſus Ruffin.* ſays *Quis imperator juſſit Synodum hanc congregari.*

Thirdly,

Thirdly, did the *preſidency in Oecumenick Councils belong to Biſhops of* Rome *alone?* Can any Ancient Canon of Council, Oecumenick, or provincial, to this purpoſe be alleadged? In the *Nicen* the *Pope* of *Rome* was not preſent, Neither did his Legats preſide, elſe how came it that *Hoſius* Biſhop of *Corduba* did ſubſcribe before them? Its a bold allegation contrary to all antiquity that *Hoſius was the Biſhop of Romes Legat. Euſeb. Sozom. Theodoret* mention only two of his *Legats*, *Vitus or Victor*, and *Vincentius*, Presbiters. Neither doth *Hoſius* ſubſcribe as *Legat* but only as Biſhop of *Corduba*. That *Hoſius* preſided in the Council of *Sardica* (which Romaniſts hold as *Oecumenick*) is clear from the Council. Nor can Romaniſts deny but *Nectarius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* preſided in the firſt *Oecumenick* Council held in that place. Did not *Cyril* Biſhop of *Alexandria* preſide in the *Epheſin* Council? Nor did he thus meerly as *Legat* from the Biſhop of *Rome*, though indeed in the beginning of the Synod, he did repreſent the Biſhop of *Rome*, even as *Flavianus* Biſhop of *Philippi*, did the place of *Rufus* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica*, for afterwards the Biſhop of *Rome* ſent three *Legats* to the Council, *Arcadius* and *Projectus* Biſhops, and *Philippus* a Presbiter without any mention of *Cyril* in the commiſſion, yet S. *Cyril* ſtill continued preſes. In the other *Epheſin*, *Synod*, which likewiſe was only declared illegitimate, becauſe of its unjuſt proceedings, *Dioſcorus* Biſhop of *Alexandria* was preſes. But this was not charged as a treſpaſs on that Council that the preſidency was given to *Dioſcorus*. In the fifth *Oecumenick* Council *Vigilius* Biſhop of *Rome* did not preſide, but the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, whether *Mennas* or *Eutychius* is not needful here to be diſputed. By this (I ſuppoſe) may be clear that the preſidency in *Oecumenick* Councils was not ſolely appropriated to the Biſhop of *Rome*.

Fourthly, was it allowed in primitive times *that appeals ſhould be made from Oecumenick Synods to the Biſhop of Rome?* Sure I am St. *Cyprian Epiſt.* 55. concerning the caſe of *Fortunatus* and *Faliciſſimus* could not endure that the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould recognoſce the ſentences of thoſe who had been judged in *Africk*. The Council of *Milevu can.* 22. prohibits appeals to be made but to *African* Councils, yea ordaines thoſe to be Excommunicated who ſhall adventure on tranſmarine appeals, that is, on appeals to *Rome*, neither does *Bellarmins* evaſion ad-

advantage him, as if this Canon did prohibit only tranſmarine appeals to be made by Presbiters, But not by Biſhops, for in the Greek edition of this Canan which is the 31. in *Zonaras* his collection of the Canons of *Carthage*, after mention is made of Presbiters, its added ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ ἐπισκόπων πολλάκις ἤδη ὥρισται, that is, as the like hath been often ſtatuted concerning Biſhops. And beſides the ſixth Council of *Carthage* upon a long debate with three Biſhops of *Rome*, pleading for appeals, decreed that no appeals be made to *Rome*, either by Biſhop, or Presbiter and convicted the Biſhop of *Rome* of falſhood pretending a *Nicen* Canon for appeals to *Rome*. Yea, Pope *Damaſus in Epiſt. ad Theoph. & Anyſ.* (which is the fifth among *Ambroſe* Epiſtles, or Pope *Syricius*, whom others will have to be the Author of that *Epiſtle*) confeſſes he cannot judge in the caſe of *Bonoſus*, the Synod of *Capua* (which yet was not *Oecumenical*) having paſſed a previous ſentence therein. The cavils of Romaniſts whereby they would perſwade the World that the right of appeals was acknowledged Anciently to belong to the *See* of *Rome*, might eaſily be confuted, Did I not ſtudy to avoide prolixity.

That which is moſt ſpeciouſly objected is the *fifth Canon of the Sardican Council*, but to forbear to reſume all the anſwers made by Proteſtant Authors, let it ſuffice to Advertiſe the Reader, that the Council of *Sardica* was no *Oecumenick* Council, elſe it ſhould be reckoned as the ſecond next the *Nicen*, which it never was, and ſure it is, that the Oriental Biſhops would not aſſemble with the occidental, but departed thence to *Philippopolis*, as teſtifies *Socrates lib.* 3. *cap.* 10. and Conſequently could make no Canons obligative to the univerſal Church. Hence *Zonaras* expounding that very Canon, affirms that it only warrants appeals to be made to the Biſhop of *Rome*, by thoſe that were ſubject to the Patriarchat of *Rome*, as many of the Weſtern Churches at that time were, which afterward became ſubject to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. This may be illuſtrated by a parallel Canon of a Council, truely *Oecumenical*, *viz.*, of *Chelcedon*, in favours of the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, for *Can.* 17. that Biſhop is made judge of all controverſies among Biſhops. Were this to be underſtood univerſally, the Biſhop of *Rome* himſelf ſhould be ſubject to the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*. But *Zonaras*, though a Greek, yet

in

in expounding this other Canon, acknowledges that albeit no reſtriction be expreſſed in the Canon it ſelf, it is to be limited to thoſe who were ſubject to the Patriarchat of *Conſtantinople*, leſt encroachment ſhould be made on other *Sees*, Conſequently, by parity of Reaſon, the Canon of *Sardica* (which was no *Oecumenick* Council) muſt be limited to thoſe that were ſubject to the Patriarchat of *Rome*. And ſo much the rather, ſeeing the *African* Fathers profeſſed they knew no ſuch decree of any Council, warranting appeals from them to *Rome*, whereof ſo many Learned Fathers, no fewer then 217. among whom was S. *Auguſtin* could not have been ignorant, had there been ſuch a decree of an *Oecumenick* Council.

Fifthly, that the primitive Church aſcribed not *infallibility to the Biſhop of Rome*, may appear from the contradictions he met with from the Fathers of the *Aſiatick* and *African* Churches, the teſtimonies which this Phamphleter alleadged, for an infallible viſible Judge have been diſcuſſed, *cap.* 2.

Sixthly, the Pope of *Rome* claimes *a ſuperiority over Princes, in ordine ad ſpiritualia*, So did not the Ancient Church. *Super Imperatorem* (ſaid *Optatus lib.* 3. *non eſt niſi ſolus Deus, qui fecit imperatorem*, and *Tertul. in Apol. cap.* 30. *Imperatores in ſolius Dei ſunt poteſtate, a quo ſunt ſecundi, poſt quem primi ante omnes, & ſuper omnes Deos & homines*, to this alſo I ſpoke *Pap.* 8. againſt Mr. *Denſter Pag.* 172. but have got no reply, Yea, Jeſuits would be exempting all the Clergy from the juriſdiction of Princes, Hence *Bell. lib. de cler. cap.* 28. *non poſſunt à magiſtratu politico puniri, vel ullo modo trahi ad magiſtratus ſeculares tribunal.* If you ask what they hold in caſe one of their Clergy become guilty of *Leſ-Majeſty*, *Endemon* the Jeſuit and *Simancha* as cited by *Davenant, determin queſt.* 17. . Anſwer, That it is an unſuppoſable caſe, *in regard they are not ſubject to Princes*. Which is diametrally repugnant both to Scripture, and Antiquity. *Rom.* 13. 1. *Let every Soul be ſubject to the Higher Powers*. Every Soul, that is, ſaith, St. *Chryſoſt.* Whether he be Evangeliſt, Prophet, or Apoſtle.

Seventhly, the *Popes of Rome have now laid aſide Preaching*, which is the Principal function of Paſtors, ſo did not the Ancient *Biſhops of Rome*, as may appear by the yet extant Sermons of *Leo* and *Greg.* Yea *Roffenſis cont. Luth. art.* 25. *Fol.* 248. *edit. Antwerp.* 1545. confeſſes that the Ancient Biſhops of *Rome*

did

did by Sermons inſtruct the people, though the preſent Biſhops of *Rome*, *aliis preſſi negotijs regnent ſolum, non paſcant*, being taken up with other affaires, only reign, but have not leaſure to Preach.

Eightly, was the *power of canonization of new Saints, appropriated in the firſt three Centuries to the Biſhops of Rome?* The firſt whom *Bell. lib.* 1. *de beat. Sanct. cap.* 8. could alleadge, to have exerciſed this act of canonization, was Pope *Leo the third*, who lived about the end of the eight Century. By theſe particulars, to which many more might be added, it may appear that the Popedome it ſelf is but a bundle of Innovations.

In place of a ninth Inſtance I appeal Romaniſts to ſhew from the firſt three Centuries, their *Florentin* and *Trent* Doctrine, *ſuſpending the efficacy of Sacraments from the intention of the Prieſt*, as it is expounded by *Bell. Suarez. Val. Lug. Becan*, &c. In oppoſition to *Catharinus*, though this was one of the firſt objections moved againſt Mr. *Denter*, yet I have not found a teſtimony of Antiquity brought by the Pamphleter, to juſtify the Romiſh Doctrin in this thing.

Inſtance tenth, and laſt (not to rake longer in the puddle of Romiſh innovations) ſhall be *the impoſed neceſſity of a celibat on the Romiſh Clergy*, So manifeſt a Novelty that *Pol. Virg. lib.* 5. *de invent. rerum cap.* 4. ſays Pope, *Syric.* about the end of the fourth Century, was the firſt who offered to impoſe it, which he proves from *Gratian part.* 1. *diſt.* 82. and yet that this law did not univerſaly prevail in the Weſtern Church, until the time of *Greg.* 7. in the eleventh Century, after this alſo it met with ſome oppoſition, until *Caliſtus the ſecond* who took the chair, *Anno* 1119. and conſtrained all under his juriſdiction to ſubmit to this impoſition, Hence theſe Lines paſſed upon him.

O bone Calixte nunc omnis Clerus odit te,
Quondam Presbiteri poterant uxoribus uti,
Hoc deſtruxiſti, poſt quam tu papa fuiſti.

So long was it before the Latin Church was fully conquered by the Tyranny of Popes, univerſally to take on that Yoke, but the Greek Church never yeelded to it, as is acknowledged by

by *Gratian. diſt.* 31. *can. aliter. Aliter ſe orientalium traditio habet eccleſiarum, aliter hujus* S. R. *eccleſiæ, nam illarum ſacerdotes, Diaconi & ſubdiaconi, Matrimonio copulantur.* i. e. the Tradition of the Eaſtern Churches is otherwiſe then of the Roman, for their Prieſts, Deacons, and Subdeacons are joyned in marriage. If you will Judge of Antiquity by the Canons which go under the name of the Apoſtles, the ſixth of them runs thus, *Epiſcopus, Presbiter, aut diaconus uxorem ſuam prætextu religionis non abjicito*, let no Biſhop, Presbiter, or Deacon put away his Wife under pretext of Religion. *Clemens Alex. lib.* 7. *Strom.* ſays *perfecti Chriſtiani edunt, bibunt, contrahunt matrimonium*, perfect Chriſtians Eate, Drink and Marry. Surely then the πλειωσις ἱερατικὴ, the perfection of holy orders is not ſtayned by Marriage. *Sozom. lib.* 1. *cap.* 11. tells of Biſhop *Spiridion* ἰγνῶτο γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἁπλοῦς, γαμετὴν καὶ παῖδας ἐχῶν, ἀλλ' ὡ δὲ τοῦτο τὸ θεῖα χαρίζν, he was a plain man having Wife and Children, but not at all the worſe, or thereby hindred in holy things. The like teſtimony is given to *Greg.* Biſhop of *Nazianzum*, Father to *Greg.* the Divine. Many more of this kind could be reckoned out, as *Polycrates, Cheremon, Synefius, Sydonius, Appollinaris*, &c. What the Liberty of theſe times was, may appear by St. *Athanaſius* anſwer to *Dracontius*, who was inclining rather to remain a *Monk*, then to be a Biſhop, becauſe he ſaw the Biſhops Married men, to whom *Athanaſius* anſwered, he might be a Biſhop and abide unmarried, for (ſays he) *multi ex Epiſcopis matrimonia non junxerunt, Monachi contra liberorum patres facti ſunt, quemadmodum viciſſim Epiſcopos filiorum patres, & Monachos generis poſteritatem non quæſiviſſe, animadvertas.* The Lines of *Mantuan* concerning *Hilary of Poytiers* are known.

Non nocuit tibi Progenies, non obſtitit uxor,
Legitimo conjuncta thoro, non horruit illa,
Tempeſtate Deum thalamos, cunabula, tadas.

The Council of *Gangra can.* 4. pronounces an anathema upon them who refuſe to communicate with a Miniſter, becauſe he is in a Married ſtate. Its far from Proteſtants to condemn an unmarried eſtate, its the impoſing the *neceſſity of a celibat* they diſallow, by which ſays *Caſſander in Conſult. art.* 23.

ad

ad omne libidinis & flagitii genus feneſtra aperta eſſe videtur, a gate is opened to all manner of licentiouſneſs and impiety, for, ſays he, things are come to that paſs *ut vix centeſimum inveniat, qui à commercio fœminarum abſtineat*, hardly one of an hundred of theſe Prieſts live chaſtly, and that there are among them whoſe conſcienc s not ſuffering them to live in conſtant whoredom, *privatim conjugium ineunt*, do Marry privately, whereupon the more ſober and ingenuous among Romaniſts have wiſhed the abrogation of that Law which impoſed *Celibat*, ſuch as *Charles the fifth in his interim*, Pope *Pius the ſecond* as *Platina* relates of him in his Life, the *Abbot of Panormo*, *Polid. Virg. Caſſander*, *Eraſmus*. The *aphoriſm of Æneas Sylvius* afterward Pope *Pius the ſecond*, is known *Sacerdotibus magnâ ratione ſublatas nuptias, majori reſtituendas videri*, i. e. If once there was good reaſon to take Marriage from Prieſts, now there appeared better reaſon for reſtoring it to them. Yet that hot Spur *Turrian* the Jeſuit maintained *Celibat* to be ſo eſſential to holy Orders even by a *jus divinum*, that its no more lawful to permit Clergy men to Marry, then to permit men to ſteale, for which judicious *Caſſander* ſmartly takes him up as a New *Italian* dogmatiſt. Never the leſs he wants not adherents as *Medina*, *Joannes Major*, and *Clichtoveus*, ſaith Jeſuit *Tirin.* But this is condemned by *Aquinas* 2. 2. *q.* 88. *art.* 21. and by *Bell. lib. de cler. cap.* 18. and many others, who becauſe they find the Pope diſpenſing with the *vow of Celibat*, therefore hold that its annexed to ſacred orders only by poſitive Law, yet they call it Apoſtolick. But ſure, if it be Apoſtolick its Divine alſo. Therefore there is a third party among them, who confeſs it wholly an humane Law (ſo exceeding are thoſe men broke among themſelves, how vainly ſo ever they boaſt of unity) Hence *Gratian cauſ.* 26. *q.* 2. *cap. Sors. Copula Sacerdotis nec legali, nec Evangelica, nec Apoſtolica authoritate prohibetur, Eccleſiaſtica tamen interdicitur.* Where the Eccleſiaſtick Law injoyning *Celibat* is contradiſtinguiſhed from all Divine Law, whether legal, Evangelical, or Apoſtolical. But the more ſober and ingenuous party among them are born down by the violent and Jeſuited faction, who conclude with *Bell. lib. de Cler. cap.* 19. *nullo modo expedire hoc tempore ut relaxetur.* So pertinacious are they that though the more ingenuous of their own Church, have bewailed the impieties which that impoſition hath produced, and thereupon have

pleaded

pleaded to have the ſeverity of that Law mitigated, yet the hot heads conclude, Its not at all expedient that there ſhould be any relaxation of that impoſition, they will rather hold on their Clandeſtin whoredoms (if they may be termed Clandeſtin after ſo many ſolemn teſtimonies of them) then grant the liberty of Gods Ordinance of marriage. Might they not at leaſt have remembred that many of their Popes were the Sons of Presbiters, as *Boniface* the firſt, *Agapetus*, *Sylverius*, & many more, as witneſſes *Platina*. Either then theſe Popes muſt be Baſtards, which *Gratian* cannot endure *diſt* 56. *cap. Oſius papa*, or the Church in thoſe days impoſed not the neceſſity of a celibat. Doth not *Auſtin hæreſ.* 40. profeſs that the Church in his days, *plurimos habuit Monachos & clericos conjugio utentes*, Many Monks and Clergy men living in a Married eſtate. I will conclude therefore with the ſaying of thoſe in *Mantuan.*

Tutius eſſe volunt qua lex Divina ſinebat,
Iſſe via, veterumq; ſequi veſtigia patrum,
Quorum vita fuit melior cum conjuge, quam nunc
Noſtra ſit, excluſis thalamis, & conjugis uſu.

That the old primitive Biſhops and Miniſters lived more Holyly with their Wives, then now adays is done without them; and therefore it is ſafer to walk in their footſteps, to which we are pointed by the Law of God.

Thus I have hinted at another decad of Romiſh innovations, to which many more might be added. I am not ignorant of the Cavils, whereby the advocates of the Romiſh cauſe endeavour to hide the Novelty of theſe things from the eyes of the World. Some of them I have touched here, others for brevities ſake I have paſſed by, but all are fully confuted by our controverſiſts. When I conſider the deceitful pretexts of Antiquity, whereby Romaniſts do Varniſh over their inventions, my heart cannot but bleed for the people, who are implicitely given up to ſuch notorious Cheats. Its pure compaſſion to miſled Souls, which drawes this freedom from me, and not any choler or prejudice againſt perſons.

A Second APPENDIX to CHAP. VII.

The Pamphleters *impertinent Citations from* Juſtin Martyr, *together with a new Catalogue of Hereſies, falſly charged on Proteſtants, briefly diſcuſed.*

THe Pamphleter *Pag.* 156. pitches on *Juſtin Martyr*, as if from him *he could prove the preſent Romiſh Religion*, yet cannot find a veſtige in him of their infallible viſible Judge, of their Popes ſupremacy, of their adoration of Images, or Relicts, of the half communion, of their Purgatory, canonical Authority of Apocryphal Books, *&c.* Indeed *Juſtin* gives an account of the Chriſtian Religion in his days, in oppoſition both to *Heathens* and *Jews*. Seeing therefore the *Pamphleter* hath pitched upon him particularly, I appeale not only ſuch *an ignorant Plagiary as this perſon*, but all the induſtrious Antiquaries of the *Romiſh Party*, to try if in *Juſtin Martyr* the complex of the preſent *Tridentin Faith* can be found. If they can demonſtrate it, I faith fully promiſe to turn a Herauld of their Religion. If not, which themſelves know to be impoſſible for them to do, let them ceaſe to abuſe ſimple Souls, as if their Religion were the Religion of *Juſtin Martyr* and of Ancient Fathers.

But hath the *Pamphleter* made any new diſcoveries from *Juſtin Martyr?* Not at all. Only he has filched four *trivial objections from Bell.* which conclude nothing againſt Proteſtants. The *Firſt is concerning free-will.* All that *Juſtin Martyr* ſays as to this, we do admit, for he neither aſſerts that man does that which is ſpiritually good without grace, nor that the efficacy of

of grace does depend on mans will. Of this I have ſpoken ſufficiently *cap.* 7. in the examination of the *Pampbleters* eighth *Inſtance.* The *ſecond is concerning merit*, but *Juſtin* only aſſerts *their is a reward for the Righteous*, from which an argment to proper merit is wholly inconſequent, ſeeing their is *a reward of grace, as well as of debt.* Concerning this alſo, ſee what hath been ſaid *cap.* 7. *Inſtance.* 9. The *third is of the efficacy of Baptiſm*, concerning which we likewiſe grant Sacraments to be exhibitive ſigns and ſeals, but *Juſtin* hath nothing of the Popiſh *opus operatum.* The *fourth is of the Euchariſt*, concerning which we likewiſe admit all that *Juſtin Martyr* ſays, viz. *that the bread and wine in the Euchariſt are not common bread and wine, being conſecrated by Divine inſtitution*, and ſo may be truly called *the body and blood of Chriſt*, as ſigns uſually receive the denomination of the thing ſignified. But does *Juſtin Martyr* ſay, as Romaniſts, that the ſubſtance of bread and wine is deſtroyed, and the phyſical body and blood of Chriſt ſubſtituted under thoſe accidents of *bread and wine?* The fiction of *Tranſubſtantiation* was not hatched in *Juſtin Martyrs* days. Thus the *Pampbleters* boaſts concerning *Juſtin Martyr* have ſoon evaniſhed into Froath. Yet though *Juſtin* had dogmatized in all theſe particulars, as do Romaniſts, it would not follow that he had approven the whole Syſtem of the preſent Romiſh Faith, In which many more errors are engroſſed.

Pag. 158. 159. he patches up again *a Catalogue of Hereſies* which he charges on Proteſtants, wherein he diſcovers ſo much ignorance, unfaithfullneſs and indiſcretion, that I ſhall paſs them with an overly touch.

And firſt he charges us, *with the error of Simon Magus, ſaying that men are not ſaved by good works, apud Iren. lib.* 1. *cap.* 20. Anſwer, *Simon Magus* denyed the neceſſity of good works, which we conſtantly affirm, only we deny good works to be properly meritorious of eternal Life, which was never condemned as Hereſy by any, but late Romaniſts.

Secondly he charges us, as ſaying *with Cerinthus that Children may be ſaved without Baptiſm, apud Epiph. hæreſ.* 8. But *Epiph. in hæreſ.* 8. hath no ſuch thing for there he treats *de Epicur.* Indeed *hæreſ.* 28. he treats of the *Cerinthians*, but is ſo far from imputiug that error to them, that when any of their number dyed, they Baptized a living perſon for the dead. Juſtifying,

that practiſe from 1 *Cor.* 15. 29. There be other Hereticks who deny Baptiſm to be a ſtanding ordinance of Chriſt, as *Manichees*, *Seleucians* and *Henricians apud Aug. hæreſ.* 16. *& hæreſ.* 59. (with whom *Socinians* and *Quakers* joyn iſſue) who are all condemned by Proteſtants, as may be ſeen in *Voſs de Bapt. diſp.* 7. *Theſ.* 4. *&* 5. Had the Ancient Church held Baptiſm abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation, would they have delayed it ſo long? would they in many places limited it to Eaſter and Pentecoſt? could it be but in the intervals many behoved to dye without Baptiſm? See *Socrates Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib.* 5. 21. Would the Church have expoſed them to ſuch neceſſity of periſhing Eternally? yea many Popiſh Authors deny the abſolute neceſſity of it, of whom Dr. *Morton* giveth a large account *appeal. lib.* 2. *cap.* 13. *Sect.* 5.

Thirdly, ſays he, *with Plotinians we affirm that God hath commanded ſomethings impoſſible, apud Epiph.* But tells not where. I find one *Plotinus* noted by a *Caſtro de hæreſ. lib.* 14. *tit virginitas*, for Heterodoxy concerning the ſtate of virginity, but as to a poſſibility of keeping the commands of God, he ſpeaks nothing of him. In what ſenſe God commands things impoſſible I have expounded *cap.* 7. in the examination of the *Pamphleters Inſtance* 10. and ſhew the conformity of our Doctrine herein with the Ancient Church, and the opoſite Doctrine of Romaniſts to be *Pelagianiſm.*

Fourthly, he ſays, *with Manichees apud Aug. lib.* 2. *cont. Fauſtum Manichæum we pull down Altars.* Anſw. the Altars againſt which *Fauſtus* exclaimes are Communion Tables which we allow. But St. *Auſtin* takes occaſion thereby to clear two truths which Romaniſts oppoſe, one, that they in the Holy Communion celebrate no proper Sacrifice *ſed memoriam peracti Sacrificii.* Another that they worſhip departed Saints only with that worſhip of Love and Society, *quo coluntur in hoc vita ſancti Homines*, wherewith Saints in this Life are Honoured.

Fifthly, he ſays, *with Donatiſts, we hold the Baptiſm of Chriſt and John were the ſame in Aug. lib.* 2. *cont. lit. Petil. cap.* 32. *and* 34. Anſw. *Petilian* ſaid *John* only gave water, Chriſt the Spirit, and the Holy Ghoſt fire, he denyed that by *Johns* Baptiſm the Holy Ghoſt was given at all, the contrary whereof is maintained by Proteſtants. It was really exhibitive

exhibitive of grace, though the grace was not Originally from *John.*

What ſixthly, he objects *of our denying with the Aerians the Falls of the Church, and Prayers for the dead*, he had ſaid before *Sect.* 5. *Pag.* 99. and accordingly was confuted, *cap.* 4. *Sect.* 2.

Seventhly, he ſays, *we with Julian forbid the uſe of Images, and ſign of the croſs, apud Sozom. lib.* 5. *cap.* 20. *and Euſeb. lib.* 7. *cap.* 14. who may not here ſee this *Pampbleter* Scratches up his Citations implicitly from others, for *Euſeb.* neither does nor could relate ſuch a thing of *Julian*, being dead before *Julian* came to the Empire. Yea, *Julian* was ſo far from being an enemy to Image worſhip, that *Spondan, ad annum* 362. *n.* 6. ſhews how *Julian* endeavoured to engage Chriſtians to worſhip the Images of his Heatheniſh Idols. And *Nazianz. orat.* 3. calls him *Idolianum.* As for us we do not ſimply condemn the uſe of Images, and Croſſes, but adoration of them, as hath been cleared up. *cap.* 7. *Inſtance* 7. But of adoration of Images there's not a veſtige in theſe places cited. only *Sozomen* relates that *Julian* pulled down that ſtatue at *Ceſarea*, which was ſaid to be Chriſts and ſet up his own in place of it, which was ſtricken from Heaven with Thunder. The Apoſtat having erected his own ſtatue in ſpite againſt Chriſt, and *cap.* 5. when *Julian* had commanded to reedify the Temple of *Jeruſalem*, there came fire out of the Earth and conſumed the Builders, and its ſaid the figurs of Croſſes and Stars appeared upon their Cloaths, But of adoration of Images, or of Croſſes, nothing is ſaid. Nay its inſinuated that ſome in thoſe times doubted the truth of the Relation.

What eightly is objected to us, from *Hierome, concerning the Hereſies of Jovinian and Vigilantius* was objected before, *Sect.* 5. *pag.* 100. and diſcuſſed *cap.* 4. *Sect.* 2.

Ninthly, he ſays, that *with Pelagians we brag of aſſurance of Salvation, apud Hierom. lib.* 3. *cont. Pelag.* We do not brag of it, we only ſay through grace it may be attained, yet make it not abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation, neither was this ever condemned as a *Pelagian* error. That which St. *Hierom* refutes in the place cited as *Chamier* ſhews *lib.* 3. *cap.* 20. *Sect.* 4. Is the ſinleſs perfection in time, which *Papiſts* and *Quakers* following *Pelagians* do maintain,. yea, not only Ancient Fathers

but

but alſo diverſe Popiſh Authors aſſent to us in the matter of aſſurance as St. *Ambroſe*, *Catharinus*, *Marcus*, *Marinarius*, &c.

Tenthly, he ſays, *with Jovinians we maintain that they who have received grace in Baptiſm cannot finally fall away apud Auguſt.* But the Hereſy where with St. *Auguſt. in hæreſ.* 82. (which I think the *Pampleter* would have cited) charges *Jovinian* was, that he affirmed, that after Baptiſm men could not ſin. Which none of us affirm, an immunity from final Apoſtacy, and a total immunity from ſin are very different things.

Eleventhly, he ſays, *that with Vigilantius we hold Church men ought to marry, apud Hieron. cont. Vigil.* we ſay no ſuch thing, we only ſay, its lawful for them, but not that they are bound to do it. is there not a difference betwixt *Licere* and *Opertere?*

Twelfthly, He charges us *with the madneſs of the Anthropomorphits, ſaying that the body of Chriſt remaines not in the Euchariſt, if it be keept till the morrow, apud Cyrill ad Colloſyrium.* To this objection of *Breerlys*, it was long ago replyed by Dr. *Marton appeal. lib.* 5. *cap.* 8. and *lib.* 2. *cap.* 3. that Romaniſts do more reſemble the madneſs of the *Anthropomorphits* by picturing and worſhiping God the Father, in the likeneſs of an old man, and that Proteſtants do not altogether condemn all reſervations of the Euchariſt, eſpecially theſe in the Ancient Church, in order to eating and participation, in caſe of abſence from the congregation, thorow ſickneſs and perſecution, and in ſuch reſervations for Sacramental uſe, the conſecrated elements remaine to be the body and blood of Chriſt Symbolically, which is all that *Cyril* intended, for then the Sacramental action is continued. But the Popiſh reſervations for circumgeſtation, proceſſion, and adoration, is a manifeſt innovation without any veſtige of Antiquity. Ancients were wont to give the remainders of the Euchariſt to Children, or School Boys, to be eaten ſays *Niceph. Hiſt. lib.* 17. *cap.* 25. and *Euag. Hiſt. lib.* 4. *cap.* 35. which was an evidence they looked not on them as a Sacrament, when the Sacramental uſe ceaſed, elſe they would not have given theſe elements to Children, who could not diſcern the Lords body. I only add that theſe reſervations uſed by Ancients, are now abrogated in the Romiſh Church,

Church, as is acknowledged by *Durant. de ritibus, lib.* 1. *cap.* 16.

Thirtenthly, What he objects *of Pelagians concerning Baptiſm, of Eunomians concerning juſtification by Faith alone, and of Arrians concerning Tradition*, was objected *Pag.* 100. and was accordingly diſcuſſed *cap.* 4. *Sect.* 2.

Fourtenthly, He ſhuts us all *with three teſtimonies concerning the infallibility of the Church of Rome.* The *two firſt are from* St. *Cyprian.* and St. *Iren.* which he oft repeats in his Pamphlet. That *of Iren.* I examined *cap.* 7. *Inſtance* 1. I ſhall now therefore only take notice of that from *Cyp.* and of the other from *the Council of Chalcedon.* Who would not admire the impudency of this *Pampleter*, there being no more luculent witneſſes againſt the infallibility, and ſupremacy of the Pope then St. *Cyp.* and the *Council of Chalcedon?* He repreſents *Cyprians* teſtimony thus *Epiſt.* 55. *to Peters Chaire, and the principal Church, infidelity or falſe Doctrine cannot have acceſs.* To which its anſwered, 1. That if an argument hold from that teſtimony of St. *Cyp.* for papal infallibility, it will likewiſe conclude all the beleeving Romans to be infallible, for their *Cyprian* ſays, *ad Romanos, quorum fides Apoſtolo prædicante laudata eſt, perfidia non poteſt habere acceſſum*, that perfidy can have no acceſs to beleeving Romans. But ſecondly who warranted the *Pampleter* to render, *perfidia*, by infidelity or falſe Doctrine. As of St. *Cyprian* were only ſpeaking of errors in dogmatical points, where as certainly *Cyprians* words relate alſo, if not principally to queſtions of fact, for he ſubjoyns *æquum & juſtum eſt, ut uniuſcujuſque cauſa illic audiatur, ubi crimen admiſſum eſt.* Its juſt that every mans cauſe be heard in that place, where the crime was committed. ſo that the perfidy of which *Cyprian* ſpeaks may be expounded of unfaithfulneſs in judging of crimes, and in examining of ſuch queſtions of Fact. I ſuppoſe Romaniſts will grant Popes may erre, yea *Cyprian* a little after, pleads the Authority of the *African Biſhops* to be no leſs then of the *Italian Biſhops* for judging in ſuch caſes. Thirdly does not *Cyprian Epiſt.* 74. *ad Pompeium* accuſe Pope *Stephanus* not only of error but as mantaining *cauſam hæreticorum*, the cauſe of Hereticks againſt the Church. Unleſs therefore St. *Cyprian* be made to contradict himſelf, he cannot here aſſert the infal-

libility

infallibility of the Romish Church. Fourthly and lastly, these words *non potest habere accessum*, cannot have access; must not be strained, as excluding a possibility of erring, *Non potest*, being frequently taken for that, which could not readily or easily be, as matters then stood. Examples might be brought from Sacred, and prophane Writings, yea and from *Cyprian* himself, *Luk.* 11. 7. when the man said, I cannot rise, he meant not impossibility of rising. Is not *Ciceros* phrase known, *facere non potui, ut nihil tibi literarum darem*, yea and St. *Cyprian* himself in *Concil. Carthag. sent.* 1. *nullus Episcopus potest alium judicare*, yet the present usurpation of the Romish Bishop shews their is no impossibility in the thing.

As to the last testimony, which is *from the Council of Chalced. act.* 16. Where all primacy, and chief Honour is said to be kept to the *Bishop of Rome*, he should have remembred that presently it is subjoyned. That the same Honours are due to the *Bishop of Constantinople*. The Council of *Chalcedon* was so far from acknowledging the absolute supremacy of the *Bishop of Rome*, that upon that account, its disallowed by the Popes of *Rome*, as testifies *Bell. lib.* 2. *de pont. cap.* 18 Is it not superlative effrontedness to Triumph on the testimony of those Fathers which themselves are constrained do disallow for opposing the primacy of their Pope? Must not these men be *αὐτοκατακρίτοι* self condemned?

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

A Confutation of the Pamphleters *Laſt* Section, *wherein, beſide other things, his three Notes of the* Catholick Church, *viz.* Miracles Converſion of Infidels, *and* Sanctity of Life, *are examined, and by them alſo the Truth of the reformed Religion, and falſhood of the* Popiſh Religion, *is Demonſtrated.*

THe *Pamphleter* in his laſt *Section* ſhuts up all with an empty Triumph, as if in the former *Sections* he had demoliſhed the reformed Religion, and in this did eſtabliſh the Romiſh Church, as the truly Catholick Church; and the preſent Romiſh Religion, as the only true Chriſtian Religion. But I hope it ſhall ſhortly appear, he feeds himſelf with a fancy, for to ſay the Truth, Popery is but a Leproſie ſuperinduced upon the Chriſtian Religion.

SECT. I.

A bundle of the Pamphleters *moſt impudent Slanders againſt Proteſtants Rejected.*

FOr raiſing this his Babyloniſh Pyramid from *Pag.* 161. *to* 164. he charges Proteſtants with impious tenents moſt falſly, as *that they change faiths certainty into probability, mock at the motives of credibility, affirm errors in integrals to be indifferent to our beleefe, that in penning Scripture the Apoſtles themſelves were not infallible,* (of this laſt blaſphemy he accuſes *Raynolds* and *Whittaker*, but like one who had Learned the art of Slandering, he tells not where) *that Proteſtants ſet forth a new Goſpel of their own,*

finding no true Scripture before, that they abandon the Ancient Church as the Synagogue, that they allow no faſting but for temporal ends, that beſt actions are ſins, and hold beleeving an eaſie task, that we acknowledge no Authority of Councils, and Fathers, yeeld to no evidence of reaſon, ſubmit to no judge, &c. All and every one of which Proteſtant Churches execrate as abominable poſitions. Are not ſuch arrant lyes a noble baſis for his Babyloniſh ſuper ſtructure?

SECT. II.

The Pamphleters *equivocation in propounding the grounds of the Romiſh Religion.*

AS he belies us, ſo he equivocates Jeſuitically in propounding the grounds of the Romiſh Religion *Pag.* 165. which he thus expreſſes. *Scripture and Apoſtolical Tradition conſerved in the Church, as delivered and expounded by her, as infallible propounder and judge.* Though this Sophiſter ſeem to magnify Scripture and Tradition, yet leaſt the ſimple Reader be impoſed upon, it would be adverted, 1. That Romaniſts dare not adventure their cauſe upon Scripture alone, therefore Tradition muſt be joyned with it. yea, nor ſecondly, on both joyntly, their innovations would find no patrociny in Traditions truly Apoſtolical, more then in Scripture, therefore neither Scripture nor Tradition is further to be beleeved by them, then as expounded by the Church, that is ſurely by the Romiſh Church. Thirdly, leaſt the Church ſhould be called to an account for her propoſals, ſhe muſt be held for an infallible propounder and Judge, yet, Fourthly, that none of the divided parties of the Romiſh Communion be offended, this priviledge muſt be aſcribed to the Church in General terms, not defining whither Pope, or Council be that infallible Judge. In a word though Scripture and Tradition be complemented, as if they were held as grounds of Religion, yet neither of them are really their grounds, but the deciſion of the preſent Church, that is, according to Jeſuits, what the Pope and his Jeſuited conclave pleaſe. and therefore *Pag.* 168. he undertakes to prove as his grand Theſis. *That the Churches Authority*

as

an infallible propounder is neceſſary to make the Divine truths contained in Scripture, or delivered by Apoſtolical Tradition, both ſolid and infallible grounds to us. If you abſtract then from the *Vatican* Oracle, you can have no ſolidity, or infallibility either in Scripture or Apoſtolical Tradition. A noble baſis of Faith forſooth!

SECT. III.

Three Propoſitions of the Pamphleter, *on which all the intereſt of the* Papacy *doth hang, Canvaſed.*

TO ſupport this tottering Pillar on which all their fortunes doe hang, *Pag.* 170. *Three things he undertakes to prove.* 1. *That there is an infallible propounder.* 2. *That the true Church is this infallible propounder.* 3. *That the Roman Church is the only true Church.* If he fail in proving any of theſe, the Romiſh intereſt periſhes infallibly; much more if he ſuccumb in them all, let us therefore trace him a little.

SUBSECT. I.

The Pamphleters *Sophiſms for his firſt Propoſition*, viz. *That their is an infallible Propounder, briefly Diſcuſſed.*

FOr the infallibility of a Propounder (which I hope was ſufficiently confuted, *cap.* 2.) he *argues firſt* thus *Pag.* 170. *if their be no infallible propounder, then holy Scripture is propounded by fallible means, and ſo there can be no infallible certainty of Faith.* Anſw. 1. This argument might more forcibly be retorted *ad hominem.* The Scriptures according to this *Pamphleter* are corrupted both in originals and Tranſlations. *Ergo*, there has been no infallible propounder, elſe the Scriptures had been better looked to. But ſecondly, I anſwer, by denying his laſt conſequence, for to the certainty of Faith, its enough that we have a certain and infallible rule of Faith, though it be conveyed to us by fallible Hands. Even as though *Euclids* ele-

elements be conveyed to me by a fallible Hand, yet the evidences of his demonſtrations may breed in me an infallible aſſent to his propoſitions. So the infallible certainty of the Scriptures, as the rule of Faith, may beget an infallible aſſent to Divine truths, though the Hands by which it is conveyed were not infallible. Its true it might have miſcarried in the conveyance, had not the watchful providence of a gracious God preſerved his holy word from periſhing, or being corrupted. Yea, the fallibility of the means and Hands by which it is tranſmitted to us, demonſtrates the ſpecial care that God has of his Church, that notwithſtanding the means were ſo fallible in themſelves; yet God preſerved the Scriptures infallibly. Nor can it rationally be denyed that the means of conveyance are of themſelves fallible, ſeeing he made uſe of infidel *Jews* to preſerve the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament, as well as of the Chriſtian Church. But I anſwer, Thirdly, the moſt that this objection can conclude, is that the Tradition of the Church whereby ſhe atteſts the Truth of the Scriptures, is certain, which Proteſtants freely admit, and make uſe of it, as one of the motives of Credibility, to prove the truth of the Scriptures. Neither is that to be looked upon as a Tradition ſimply unwritten, the ſame truth being written that *all Scriptures are of Divine inſpiration*, 2 *Tim.* 3. Neither in any meaſure doth it infringe the ſufficiency of the written word. As when a faithful tabellarius brings a Letter fully containing his Maſters mind, he may atteſt the truth of the Letter, although he remit all the particulars of his Maſters will to be gathered from the Letter it ſelf. And indeed it is much more eaſie to atteſt the truth of a Letter, then faithfully to remember, and give an account of many intricate particulars. In this laſt a very honeſt Meſſenger thorow weakneſs might fail. This ſimile is Excellently improven by Dr. *Taylour*, *Part.* 2. Of his diſſwaſive in the Introduction.

The Pamphleter *argues*, ſecondly *ibid. Faith comes by hearing and therefore as there are infallible hearers and beleevers, ſo alſo infallible Teachers*, Anſw. What do Romaniſts and Jeſuits prate of infallible beleevers? Do they not teach that beleevers may totally apoſtatize and become Infidels? A goodly infallibility forſooth! If implicit Romaniſts be infallible beleevers, why may

may not the Turkiſh Muſelmans alſo pretend to infallibility in beleeving the *Alcoran!* But though this Pamphleter do rant here of infallible beleevers, yet were he at *Rome* its probable he would change his tone, for as Dr. *Tiltonſon* on a like occaſion did advertiſe his adverſary, *J. S. we Proteſtants are told that at* Rome *lives an Old Gentleman, who takes it ill, if any be termed infallible beſides himſelf.* In a word therefore I anſwer, if by infallible beleevers he mean, that every beleever hath ſuch an aſſiſtance of the ſpirit, as doth exempt him from all Doctrinal errors in Religion, its denyed that beleevers are thus priviledged, the contrary being evident from the caſe of the beleeving *Galatians* and *Corinthians*, who yet were ſmitten with abſurd errors. Muſt St. *Cyp.* St. *Aug.* &c. Be diſcarded from the number of beleevers, becauſe of the errors where with theſe bleſſed Souls were tainted? At laſt he would bethink himſelf in what category to place erroneous Popes, of whom ſome acconnt was given, *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 2. If therefore by infallible beleevers he only mean thoſe who beleeve infallible truths, upon the Authority of God ſpeaking in the Scriptures, I grant there are infallible beleevers in this ſenſe, and proportionably infallible Teachers, who teach infallible truths from the Scriptures. But hence it doth not follow that there are infallible Teachers in the Romiſh ſenſe, having an immunity from all Doctrinal errors in Religion, whereof the people muſt be aſſured before they give an aſſent of Faith to any Article of Religion. And the rather ſeeing the Faith of beleevers is not reſolved on the Authority of their Teachers, but the Faith both of Teachers, and Hearers on the Authority of God ſpeaking in the Scriptures, So that this objection at moſt proves that there are infallible truths, and an infallible rule and ground of Faith, which is freely granted.

He urges thirdly, Pag. 171. *No other infallible means of beleeving can be aſſigned, for theſe who underſtand not originals.* Anſw. What if I ſhould remit the *Pamphleter* to grapple with Dr. *Tillotſon* who maintaines that *if a man beleeve the Chriſtian Doctrine, though upon weak and competent grounds, yet if he live up in his practice to the Doctrine of Chriſtianity, he may be ſaved*, and he brings ſome reaſons to confirm this aſſertion, in the Preface before his Sermons, which I have not as yet heard that his adverſary. *J. S.* hath diſcuſſed. If that notion of the Doctor ſhould prevaile,

the

the objection of the *Pamphleter* falls to the ground. But when all that is confuted, I have this more to ſay, *viz.* that though propounders be fallible, and Hearers ignorant of Originals, yet the Doctrine it ſelf being atteſted by the miracles of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, and Sealed by the death of ſo many Martyrs, and having a ſelf evidencing Light in it ſelf, of which we ſpeake *cap.* 3. and a Divine efficacy upon the heart, there is a ſufficient and infallible ground of beleeving Scripture Truths.

He argues fourthly, ibid. *there is no leſs neceſſity that the Church be infallible in propounding, then the evangeliſts in penning.* O impudent blaſphemy! Are Romiſh propounders, Popes and Biſhops, acted by a prophetical Spirit, no leſs then the Penmen of Holy Scripture? Why then are not the definitions of their Church added to the Canon of Scripture? Popes muſt ſpeak with tongues, and work miracles before we beleeve them to have prophetical inſpiration. Is not now the Canon of Scripture conſigned? Is there need now (the rule of Faith being compleated) of the ſame aſſiſtance which was at the compiling of that rule?

He argues fifthly, ibid. *That our Saviour owns the neceſſity of an infallible propounder, granting that the Jews had not ſinned by refuſing to beleeve in him, if by his works and wonders he had not evidenced himſelf to be the Son of God.* A Childiſh argument! Chriſt indeed affirmed himſelf to be infallible, but it does not follow, *Ergo*, he owned the neceſſity of an infallible propounder in all times. I conſidered before that word of Chriſt to the Jews *Joh.* 15. and ſhew that the moſt which can be concluded from it, is, that there muſt be an objective evidence of the rule of Faith which may be without the propounders infallibility.

Sixthly, he ſays, ibid. *The gift of miracles was given to the Apoſtles and left in the Church to ſhew there infallible aſſiſtance.* Anſw. there is more here ſaid then proven, that the Apoſtles had the gift of miracles is not denyed, but that this gift was to be left in the Church, ſo as no Divine truth ſhould be beleeved, no Scripture, or ſenſe thereof aſſented to untill the infalliblility of the propounder were proven by new miracles, is more then can be made good. And if it were ſo, none of the Romiſh Miſſionaries ſhould be beleeved, for they work no miracles.

He

He ſays, if this aſſertion of his be not admitted, then all ſhould be anſwered that he Objected, Sect. 4. that being, (I hope) ſufficiently done, in its proper place, this Objection Evaniſhes.

His ſeventh and laſt objection Pag. 173. *If all Councils and all the Fathers be fallible, then let* Proteſtants *bring nothing but Scripture, and then all their Volumes of Controverſy will not come to one Line.* Behold the impudency of this Caviller! Is there not a Line of Scripture in all our controverſy writters? Would Papiſts ſtand to this appeal, that nothing be received as an Article of Faith, but what is warranted by Holy Scripture, I hope our debates with them ſhould ſoon be near an end. Is not this the chief controverſy betwixt them and us, whether the Scripture be the compleat rule of Faith, we aſſerting and they denying? But *ex ſuperabundanti* we ſhew the conſonancy of our Religion with Fathers and Ancient Councils.

Theſe his ſeven Sophiſms for the neceſſity of an infallible propounder we have the more briefly diſcuſſed, this Queſtion being at length before debated, *cap.* 2. Thus his firſt propoſition falling which is the baſis of the other two, the whole ſtructure of Roman Faith muſt come no nought.

SUBSECT. II.

The Pamphleters *ſecond Propoſition*, viz, *that the true Church is the Infallible Propounder, Conſidered.*

IF there be no neceſſity of ſuch an infallible propounder as Romaniſts contend for, as hath been proved, *cap.* 2. then his ſecond propoſition, falls with its own weight. Yet what he ſays, for this alſo ſhall briefly be taken to Conſideration.

And firſt he *remarks Pag.* 174. *that there be three Foundations or grounds of Faith*, viz, *Chriſt*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. *Secondly the Apoſtles and Prophets*, *Epheſ.* 2. 20. *Thirdly the Church*, 1 *Timoth.* 3. 15. I wonder that with *Bell.* he doth not mention a fourth. The Pope blaſphemouſly applying to him that Scripture. *Iſa.* 28. 16.

If

If any of thoſe places make for his purpoſe, it muſt be the third, 1 *Timoth.* 3. 15. but he ſhould have remembred, that its queſtioned, by interpreters whether it be the Church that is there called the Foundation, or if it be not rather that which follows, God manifeſted in the Fleſh, and if it be the Church, whether it be the Catholick Church, or only the particular Church of *Epheſus*, where *Timothy* did officiate, and if this latter, then ſurely the Foundation cannot be taken in an architectonick ſenſe for a ſupporter of Faith, but in a Politique ſenſe as a propounder of Faith which makes nothing to his advantage. But of this Text we ſpoke at large, *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 3. Now only I deſire to know how he makes the Apoſtles and Prophets a diſtinct Foundation from the Church? For if he take them perſonally then they were principal members of the Church. If he call them Foundations in regard of their writings then the place holds forth that which Proteſtants affirm, *viz.* The Scripture to be the Foundation or rule of Faith.

He endeavours *to confirm this remarke*, *Pag.* 176. *by alledging ſome promiſes of an infallible judge*, *Iſai.* 2. 2, 3. *Matth.* 16. 19. *Matth.* 18. 19. *Epheſ.* 4. 11. But none of theſe promiſe abſolute infallibility to the Church, Not that *Iſai.* 2. 2. 3. Cannot Chriſt Teach by the Scriptures, by his Spirit, yea, by Paſtors alſo, though Paſtors be not in all things infallible? yet while Paſtors adhere to the rule of the word they are *de facto* infallible, albeit they have not entailed to them a perpetual aſſiſtance in all things, whereof the Hearers muſt antecedently be aſſured before they beleeve any thing propounded by them. Nor that *Matth.* 16. 19. Indeed the rock Chriſt on which the Church is built is infallible, but not the Church. The not prevailing of the gates of Hell againſt her, prove no more her infallibility then her impeccability. It only holds out Satan ſhall not be able utterly to extinguiſh a Church. Nor yet *Matth.* 18. 19. I ſuppoſe all the Logick of *Italy* will not prove that Chriſt enjoyned us to hear the Pope if he defined vertue to be vice, as *Bell.* would have us *lib.* 4. *de Pontif. cap.* 5. only the Church is to be heard, when ſhe adheres to the rule of the word, of theſe two places ſee more, *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 3. Nor laſtly that *Epheſ.* 4. 11. which only holds forth Paſtors and Teachers to be ſtanding office bearers, for the edification of the Church, but not their infallibility.

His

His ſecond Argument, *Pag.* 177. is *from the unanimous conſent of the Fathers, which he ſuppoſes he hold forth in his Sect.* 3. but I hope when he conſiders what I have replyed *cap.* 2. and *cap.* 7. he will be ſenſible of his miſtake. He is as unhappy in *his Citation of ſome Proteſtant Authors*, whom he pretends to have acknowledged *the Church to be an infallible propounder of Divine truths, ſuch as Whittaker, Chillingworth, Hooker, Covell*, &c. He might have underſtood the falſhood and impertinency of ſuch alleadgances from them, who confuted Mr. *Knot*, Mr. *Breerly*, &c. from whom he filched theſe ſhreds. Does any of theſe Authors acknowledge the infallibility of any repreſentative Church in all points of Faith, far leſs of the preſent Roman Church? Verily none. The impudency of Romiſh writers in ſuch Citations may be ſeen by the firſt Author on whom he pitches, viz. Learned *Whittaker*, not to waſt time needleſly on the reſt. Who hath been at more pains then *Whittaker* to prove *that the Church may erre, Controv.* 2. *q.* 4. that *Councils may erre, Controv.* 3. *q.* 6. that *the Pope may erre, Cont.* 4. *q.* 6. And how copiouſly has he aſſerted againſt *Stapleton*, the Authority of the Scriptures as independent from the Churches teſtimony? In what ſenſe, ſuch ſayings of Proteſtants, as here are gathered up from *Breerly*, are to be underſtood, *Chillingworth Part.* 1. *cap.* 2. from *Sect.* 3. to *Sect.* 35. expounds, *viz.*, that the Churches teſtimony is a motive to induce us to believe the Scriptures, and that by the Church they underſtand not ſo much the preſent Church, far leſs the preſent Roman Church, as the teſtimony of the Ancient and primitive Church. Let quibling Miſſionaries know, that broken ſhreads from private Authors have little weight with thoſe that are judicious. Such is that expreſſion of Dr. *Feild*, with which ſo much noiſe is made, *in his Epiſt Dedic.* concerning the Church, which, as *Chillingworth, Part.* 1. *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 86. ſhews, did unadviſedly drop from the Doctor, as its uſual with Authors to Hyperbolize in their prefaces for magnifying the Subject whereof they Write. Yet if the Doctors expreſſion be underſtood of the Church truly Catholick, as well in regard of time, as of place, his words may ſuffer a good ſenſe, and nothing to the advantage of the Romiſh intereſt.

He argues thirdly, *Pag.* 179. The *true Church is the School of Infallible and Divine truths*, Ergo, *ſhe muſt have infallible Maſters,*

and propounders. Anſw. 1. If by the antecedent he mean, that nothing is at any time taught in the true Church but infallible and Divine truths, its manifeſtly falſe. The Churches of *Corinth* and *Galatia* were true Churches, in which groſs errours were Taught; at leaſt, if that were true, the Church of *Rome* can be no true Church wherein ſo many abſurd errours are Taught. Anſw. 2. the ſequel is alſo falſe, infallible truths may be Taught *hic & nunc*, by Maſters that are fallible. None of our Romiſh Miſſionaries pretend to infallibility, either then, they teach no infallible Truth, or this ſequel muſt be falſe. But, ſaith he, *a Learned writter ſaith, a fallible Church is an holy Cheat.* Anſw. that Author had ſhewed more ſolid Learning, had he applyed this Character to the Popes infallible Chair, and to the Romiſh infallible viſible judge. If it be asked whether a fallible Church can be ground of infallible Faith? Anſwer, No ſurely, nor will the imagination of infallibility found a truly Divine and infallible Faith. But the infallible rule of Scripture, can be a ground of infallible Faith, and thereon the Faith of Proteſtants doth reſt.

Pag. 180. 181. he ſhuts up theſe his ſophiſtical arguments for his ſecond propoſition, with a ſcenical diſcourſe, by which he labours to hold out, that Proteſtants according to their principles could never convince an Heathen of the truth of Chriſtian Religion. *He brings in the* Proteſtant *producing his Bible written, 1700. years ago in which there be many contradictions, but no infallible witneſs at preſent to teſtify that this Bible was written by ſuch men, or confirmed by ſuch miracles. Only the* Proteſtant *alleadges that if the Infidel would turn* Proteſtant *he would ſee a ſelf evidencing Light in Scripture*, but if prejudice and intereſt had not blinded this *Pamphleters* eyes, he would have found that a Proteſtant could deal with a Heathen upon more ſolid ground, then a Papiſt, for a Papiſt cannot produce a Bible for his Religion, ſo many Articles thereof having no veſtige there, ſuch as the adoration of Images, invocation of Saints, worſhipping of Croſſes, and Reliques, and the monſtruous figment of Tranſubſtantiation, their unbloody Sacrifice of the Maſs, Doctrine of merits, the Popes univerſal Supremacy, &c. When the Infidel therefore demands a reaſon upon which theſe things ſhould believed, the Papiſt would reply, they had an infallible judge, and when the Infidel inquired, whom he meant by that infallible

infallible judge, and what evidences he had for his infallibility, he neither can reſolve who he is, it not being determined whether Pope or Council, nor give evidence for his infallibility, but that he muſt be believed, as being infallible, becauſe he ſaith it, which if it do not expoſe Chriſtianity to ludibry, unprejudiced perſons may judge. But Proteſtants have the ſame grounds that ever the Chriſtian Church had, in confirmation of the Articles of the Chriſtian Religion, and of the holy Scriptures, which doth fully contain them, *viz.* innumerable miracles wrought by Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, which have been atteſted both by Chriſtians and Infidels, as alſo that theſe Books have been written by Prophets and Apoſtles, hath been acknowledged by Famous perſons, within, and without the Church in all ages, and ſealed by the deaths of ſo many Martyrs. That theſe are the ſame Books, appears by comparing our Books with Ancient Copies, by Citations in the Writings of Ancient Fathers, what contrarieties do ſeem to be in Scripture, are but apparent. Let all Religions be compared together, there is none whoſe precepts are ſo Holy, no Religion which can ſatisfie a troubled conſcience, ſo as the Chriſtian Religion. Though therein be ſublime myſteries, Yet all are admirably fitted for bringing about the Salvation of ſinners, by theſe and ſuch like Arguments, a Proteſtant could ſo deal with the conſcience of any Infidel, that he could have nothing rationally to reply, and all this without having a recourſe to the infallibility of *Pope* or *Councils*. In a word, the Divine Original of the Scriptures being once evicted againſt an Infidel from the motives of Credibility, he may then be convinced of the material objects of Faith from the Scriptures.

SUBSECT. III.

The Pamphleters *third Propoſition*, viz, *that the Roman Church is the only true Catholick Church*, Conſidered.

IT remains now that we conſider what he has to ſay for this third Propoſition, viz, *that the Roman Church, that is, the Church acknowledging the headſhip and ſupremacy of the Pope of Rome, is the only true Catholick Church.* To verify this he reſumes from *Pag.* 186. three of *Bellermines* notes of the Church, *viz.* Firſt, *Miracles.* Secondly, *Converſion of Infidels*, and Thirdly, *Sanctity of Life.* Though all the improvement which Romaniſts can make of theſe hath been often examined by Proteſtants, yet the importunity of this Caviller conſtrains me to make a ſhort review of them.

ARTICLE I.

Of Miracles.

FIrſt then as *Bell. lib. de notis Eccleſiæ, cap.* 14. ſo alſo this *Pamphletor* from *Pag.* 187. preſents us with a muſter of *Miracles in every age*, much to the like purpoſe is to be found in *Breerly, Apol. tract.* 2. *cap.* 3. *Bell.* 7. *Leſſius conſult. de vera. relig. conſid.* 4. H. T's *Manual, art* 6. *&c.* Yet ſhall he not from them all, or from all the Romiſh Legendaries be able to pitch upon one true Miracle, to prove, that the preſent Romiſh Church is the true Catholick Church, or that the preſent Popiſh Religion is the only true Chriſtian Religion, It were of more advantage for their cauſe to pitch upon one true Miracle to this purpoſe, if they could, then to heap up ſuch a rapſody of Miracles, which are either fabulous and fallacious impoſtures, or if real, wholly impertinent to the point in controverſy. But becauſe ſuch a noiſe is made about Miracles, I will ſubjoyn ſome conſiderations, for the ſatisfaction of the Reader, as to this thing.

It

It may therefore in the firſt place be taken notice of, that great Authors of the Romiſh perſwaſion affirm, *that real and proper Miracles may be wrought by Hereticks to confirm Hereſies*, ſo *Maldonat in cap.* 7. *Matth.* Who cites for the ſame opinion of the Fathers, St. *Chryſoſt.* St. *Hierom*, *Euthym.* and *Theophilat*, and therefore he concludes the argument from Miracles to be but topical. To the like purpoſe many more Authors of the Romiſh Communion are cited by Dr. *Barron*, *Apodex. Cathol. tract.* 4. *Punct.* 7. as *Gerſon*, *Durand*, *Stapleton* and *Ferus*, to whom *Card. de Lugo*, *tract. de fid. diſp.* 2. *Sect.* 1. *Num.* 15. and 19. addes *Hurtado*, *Baunez*, and *Medina*, to whom alſo *Valentia* and *Oviedo* are adjoyned by *Bonaſpei*, *tom.* 2. *theol. ſcholaſt tract.* 2. *de fide diſp.* 2. *dub.* 2. If this opinion hold, Miracles cannot be a demonſtrative evidence of the truth, either of Church or Religion. I am not to own *Maldonats* opinion, leſt I ſhould ſeem to derogate from the glorious Miracles of our Saviour, or to charge the God of truth as ſetting his Seal to a lye. But I confidently affirm, that Popiſh Cavils againſt the ſelf evidencing Light of Holy Scripture, militate as ſtrongly againſt the ſelf evidence of Miracles, As Jeſuits ask how we know Scriptures to be the word of God. So we may juſtly enquire, how they know theſe things which are attributed to *Francis Dominick*, *Xavier*, &c. To be proper Miracles? As there are Apocryphal Goſpels under the names of St. *Thomas* and *Nicodemus*, ſo there have been falſe Miracles wrought by Satan and his Miniſters. Doth not the Apoſtle ſay, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 9. that *Antichriſt ſhall come with lying ſigns and wonders*. *Joſephus a Coſta*, *lib.* 2. *de Chriſto revelato*, *cap.* 8. (as I find him cited by *Rivet on Exod.* 7. *Pag.* 178. for I have not that peece of *a coſta* by me) confeſſes that it ſhall be in the time of the Antichriſt, *magna ſapientiæ variq; Divini muneris*, a rare gift of God to diſtinguiſh betwixt a true Miracle and a wonder wrought by an Impoſter. Yea *Bell.* affirms *lib. de notis Eccleſiæ cap.* 14. *that there can be no infallible certainty whether ſuch a thing be a true Miracle, or an illuſion of the Devil, ante approbationem Eccleſiæ*, before the approbation of the Church. Behold then how theſe Romiſh impoſtors run in a circle, proving the truth of their Church by Miracles, and the truth of Miracles by the teſtimony of their Church. One of the two they muſt acknowledge, either that Scripture hath a ſelf evidencing Light, which will ruin their whole

whole intereſt, or that Miracles cary not with them a ſelf evidence, and conſequently are impertinently brought as the firſt and moſt evident note of the true Church. I leave it to the deliberation of our adverſaries which of the two they will chuſe.

In the ſecond place, it would be conſidered, that there were indeed glorious miracles wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, nor do we deny that there were Miracles there after in the primitive Church alſo, yet all theſe are *Impertinently alleadged by Romiſh Authors as to this preſent Debate.* For certainly none of the real Miracles done by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, or afterwards in the days of *Irenæus*, *Juſtin Martyr*, *Cyprian*, *Gregory*, *Thaumaturg*, were wrought to prove that the Roman Church in theſe laſt days is the only Catholick Church, or that the preſent Syſtem of Romiſh Faith, as defined in the Council of *Trent*, or expreſſed in Pope *Pius the Fourth his Creed*, is the only true Chriſtian Faith. Have I not ſhewed Popery as now it ſtands, was not known in theſe days? Theſe Miracles prove the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion in thoſe days, which I have ſhewed to differ in Eſſentials from the *Trent* Religion, but to agree with the reformed Religion.

How miſerably the Pamphleter comes off as to Miracles in ancient times, may be apparent to any that takes notice of his citations, *pag.* 187. 188. His firſt citation from *Juſtin Martyr q.* 28. is out of a Book acknowledged to be ſpurious by their own Authors, *Bell. Poſſevin*, *Sixtus Senenſis*, and *Azorius*, yea, nor was it written within the firſt three Centuries, as is evicted by learned Criticks. And beſides the Author of theſe queſtions mentions not a Miracle wrought for any Popiſh Tenet, far leſs for the complex of all. Only that at the Sepulchres of Martyres, Miracles were done to confirm the truth of the Chriſtian Faith, not the worſhip of Reliques. That of *Irenæus lib.* 2. *cap.* 58. ſpeaks only of Miracles wrought by living Saints, for converſion of Infidels. What is that to the Romiſh intereſt? As for the Miracles of *Greg.* of *Neocæſarea*, commonly called *Thaumaturgus*, there is no mention of them for a hundred years after his time, until *Greg. Nyſſen.* If they were all real, is it not ſtrange that *Euſebius*, who uſes to be very punctual in theſe things, has not a touch of them? That *Orat.* of *Nyſſen de vita Greg.* is called by *Scultetus*, *Somnium Somniorum*, ſurely there be very fabulous things

things therein, as that the Virgin *Mary* and *John* came down from Heaven to teach him his Creed, which Dr. *Beard*, *retract. cap.* 12. compares to the Poetical Fiction of *Apollo*, teaching *Esculapius* the Rules of Physick, and to the Rabinick Fable of the Angel *Sanballets*, being *Adams* School-master, and *Nyssen* himself is charged by his Brother *Basil* as a simple and credulous man. But what? Did *Greg. Thaumaturg* work any Miracle to prove the whole System of the present Romish Religion to be true? No such thing can be alleadged, only in some of his Miracles he is said to have used the Sign of the Cross. What then? Do not Protestants particularly (*Hospinian lib.* 2. *de templis cap.* 20.) acknowledge the sign of the Cross, as used by Ancients to testifie that they were not ashamed of a Crucified Saviour to have been lawful, though now it be superstitiously abused. Romanists now give Religious adoration, yea, that of *Latria*, to Crosses, But no ancient Author testifies that ever *Greg. Thaumaturg* did so. What is cited from *S. Cyprian Serm. de lapsis*, *as relating Miracles to prove the Corporal presence of Christ*, *under the Accidents of Bread and Wine*, is a Jesuitical falshood; these Miracles did prove the Divine Institution of the Sacrament of the Supper, the mystery of the Incarnation, and the reality of Christs human Nature, represented by the Sacramental Symbols, but no more of the figment of Transubstantiation, then of *Mahomets* Alcoran. These are all the citations he has for the first three Ages of Christianity, if there be one Miracle here to prove the present *Trent* Religion to the only true Christian Faith, let any who are not willing to be deceived, judge.

The like impertinency may be discovered in the next three succeeding Ages, for the whole Story of the *Invention of the Cross by* Helena *the Empress and Mother of* Constantine, *and the Miracle reported by* Ruffin *and* Nicephorus *to be wrought at that time*, appears to be fabulous. Is it probable that *Eusebius*, who wrote four Books of the life of *Constantine*, would have omitted it. *Dalleus* is large in confuting it, *lib.* 5. *de object. Cultus Relig. c.* 1. But suppose it were true, was that Miracle wrought to confirm any point of Popery, far less all? No verily, the only design of it, if real, was to show that Jesus, who was Crucified on that Tree, was the Saviour of the World. *Helena* and the Christians of those days, had not learnt to adore the Cross. Hence *S. Ambrose de Obitum Theodosii*, says, *Regem adoravit non lignum*, she

ſhe adored Chriſt, but not the Tree. That of *Epiphanius*, *Hereſ.* 30. looks alſo to be fabulous, and that you think not ſtrange of this, *Epiphanius* credulity is cenſured by *Melchior Canus lib.* 2. *cap.* 5. *pag.* 477. and in many places by *Barronius*, as *Rivet.* hath obſerved in *Crit. Sac. lib.* 3. *cap.* 28. But make all real that *Epiphanius* there reports, yet the deſign of that Miracle was not to confirm any point of Popery, far leſs all, but only the Chriſtian Religion. Its true *Epiphanius* reports that *Joſephus* who formerly had been a Jew, made uſe of water in working that Miracle, but not any of the four kinds of Popiſh Holy-Water mentioned by *Durand in rationali lib.* 4. *cap.* 4. and though he uſed the ſign of the Croſs, yet he was far from the adoration of the Croſs. That from *Nazianzen Orat.* 11. *of a Virgins Invocating the Virgin* Mary *to defeat* Cyprians *Enchantments*, is acknowledged by *Barronius* himſelf to be a Fable, *ad annum* 250. *Pontius* a Deacon under *Cyprian*, who wrote his life, knew no ſuch thing. *Auſtin* indeed relates many Miracles *lib.* 22. *de Civ. cap.* 8. But not to prove that this preſent Church of *Rome* is the Catholick Church, or the preſent Syſtem of Romiſh Faith the true Chriſtian Faith, the moſt is, that at the Sepulchre of *S. Stephen*, and other Saints Miracles were wrought, but not in Veneration of his, or other Reliques. *The Dialogues attributed to* Greg. *are concluded upon*, important Reaſons ſpurious by *Cocus*, yea, by *Melchior Canus*, *lib.* 11. *cap.* 5. faith is derogated both from the relations in *theſe Dialogues*, *and* Beeds *Hiſt. Eccleſ. Anglic.* and how little faith is to be given to *Greg. Turonenſis*, may be learned from *Barronius*, *Tom.* 2. *ad An.* 109. where he calls him a ſimple man, relating many things otherwiſe then they were, ſo that in theſe other three Centuries I can ſee nothing ſave only that Miracles were wrought at the Memories of Martyrs, and perhaps divers of theſe relations alſo were fabulous, but what is this to the Body of Popiſh Errors and Superſtitions.

No better are the Pamphleters inſinuations, *pag.* 192. of the Miracles wrought by our *Scottiſh Saints*, *Saint Mungo*, *and Saint Fiaker*, adding, *That a Miracle makes the Arms of one of our Cities*, I ſuppoſe he means *Glaſgow*, which hath in her Coat of Armes a Fiſh with a Ring in its Mouth, but of St. *Mungoes* Miracles, hear Biſhop *Spotſwood*, *Hiſt. pag.* 11. of which ye may judge of the reſt. *Many lying Miracles* (ſaith he) *have been aſcribed to him*, *but*

but certainly he was a man of rare Piety, and worthy to have been made a Subject of Truth to Poſterity, not of Fables and Fictions, as the Legends of Monks have made him. As for that ſuppoſed Miracle to which the Arms of *Glaſgow* ſeem to allude, it was not wrought to confirm any point of Religion, far leſs of Popery, but to vindicate the Chaſtity of a Lady, who was unjuſtly jealouſed by her Husband, as Biſhop *Spotswood* gives an account, *pag.* 112. But if Popiſh Miſſionaries muſter up Legends to a credulous people, they ſtand not whether they be to purpoſe or not: The real ancient Miracles then are altogether impertinently alledged by the Pampleter.

I add thirdly, *that the Legendary Paltry of Romiſh Miracles of latter times, is generally ſpurious*: They might be reduced to theſe Heads; *viz.* Either 1. Meer Forgeries; or 2. Cunning Stratagems of ſubtil perſons; or 3. Magical Impoſtures; or 4. They are manifeſtly ludibrious; who pleaſe may find this largely proved by *Gerard, loc. de Eccleſ. cap.* 10. *Sect.* 11. §. 284. How oft have the Cheats of Romaniſts, as to theſe things, been diſcovered? What ſhould I ſpeak of the *Dominicans* at *Bern*, who taught an Image to weep, ſmile, and walk, *Anno* 1509. See *Lavat. de ſpectris, Part.* 1. *cap.* 7. and *Hoſpin. de Monach. lib.* 6. *cap.* 14. *fol.* 222. or of the *Franciſcans* at *Orleans*, who counterfeited the apparition of a Spirit revealing ſuch a Matron to be condemned to Hell, becauſe the Husband had not been more benefical to their Order at her Funerals. See *Sleidan lib.* 9. *Anno* 1534. and *Lavat, ibid. cap.* 8. or of *Mary* of *Lisbon*, much renowned for Miracles, who predicted a Triumphant Victory to the *Spaniſh Armado*, *Anno* 1588. yet that year ſhe was detected to be a Cheat. Or of that egregious Impoſtor *Joannes à Vincentia*, a *Franciſcan* likewiſe, who cured all manner of diſeaſes, expelled Devils, and pretended to raiſe eighteen from the Dead, yet was found alſo to be an Impoſtor, as *Crakanthrop* relates out of *Vigner*, but not till he had drawn to the Monaſtery a vaſt Revenue. Who hath not heard of *Magdalena de Cruce*, a Nun of *Corduba*, held for a Saint and Propheteſſe, and worker of Miracles, yet in the end was diſcovered to be a Sorcereſs, and one who had converſed familiarly with the Devil? *Lavat. lib. cit. c.* 9. reports, that a Jeſuit at *Auguſta* in *Germany*, *Anno* 1564. counterfeited himſelf to be a Devil, to affright ſome that had not a kindneſs for the Order, and that a daring Fellow ſtobbed that Hobgoblin Jeſuit to Death. Doth not *Eraſmus* tell how a prieſt filled

a Church-yard in the night time with living Crabs, and burning Tapers, to make the people apprehend it was departed Souls, calling for the ſuffrages of the Living for their liberation out of Purgatory? Who knows not how Pope *Boniface* 8. got the Papacy by a counterfeit Miracle, as if by the voice of an Angel Pope *Celeſtine* his Predeceſſor had been adviſed to lay down the Papacy: *Celeſtine cede, ſi ſalvus eſſe cupis?*

Such are theſe inſtances of latter times cited by the Pamphleter, *pag.* 188, 189. as may appear by this enſuing touch of them. That *bleeding of the Crucifix ſtabbed by the Jews at* Beritum, is proved to be fabulous, by *Hoſpin. lib.*2. *de Templis, cap.* 10. and *Cocus in cenſur. vet. pag.* 93. 94. 95. Such another Fable is *that of the ſecond Council of* Nice, *of the ejection of Devils, and healing of diſeaſes by the Image of* Anaſtaſius. That ſecond *Council of Nice* was moſt impudent in alledging impoſtorous Legends, as *Crakanthorp* has largely demonſtrated, *Defenſ. Eccleſ. Anglic. cap.* 65. Yea, he brings in *Eſpenæus*, confeſſing they did ſhamelеſſly abuſe *dæmonum ſpectris & muliebribus ſomniis*, diabolick ſpecters and dreams of the weaker Sex, to ſupport their Image-worſhip. *That of Pope* Leo *the Third, as if his tongue and eyes had been pulled out, and both miraculouſly reſtored*, appears to be a Forgery. For *Platina in vita Leon.* 3. ſays only, *in oculis & lingua captus putaretur. Nauclerus*, as cited by *Hottinger*, *Sæ.* 8. *Sect.* 5. *pag.* 560. lays the whole ſtreſs of the Report of that Miracle on the affirmation of *Anaſtaſius* the Popes *Bibliothecary*, a man not worthy of much credit, being convicted of many contradictions by *Baronius*, as is obſerved by *Mareſius de Joanna Papiſſa, pag.* 31. 32. and eſpecially ready to prevaricate for Popes, *Sethus Calviſius Anno* 799. ſaith, he only loſt one of his eyes. *Oſiander* ſeems to ſet down the real truth, *Cent.* 8. *pag.* 129. *Ut parum abfuerit quin oculos amitteret*, he had almoſt loſt his eyes. It ſeems *Leo* was ſo beaten, that for a time he loſt the uſe of eyes and tongue; and thereupon ſome Flatterers rumoured, that a Miracle was wrought to recover the Pope. But grant that all were true, what point of Religion was confirmed by that Miracle, that tumult was raiſed againſt him not by Pagans, as this Pamphleter alledges, but by the Friends of the laſt Pope, not for any point of Religion, but becauſe he was betraying the Roman Liberties to *Charles* the great? and does God work Miracles to confirm ſeditious practices? or muſt the

Prodigies

Prodigies of ſeditious perſons be held for Miracles to confirm the Popiſh Religion? *If famous Miracles were wrought by thoſe three Popes*, Stephanus *the Fifth*, Paſchalis *the Firſt*, *and* Formoſus, as this Pamphleter affirms, how was *Platina* ſo deficient, as to mention none of them? Nay of *Formoſus* he ſaith, he came to the Papacy, *largitione potius quam virtute*, rather by Simony than Vertue, yea and by Perjury alſo, if he wrought Miracles: I am ſure Pope *Stephanus* the Sixth had little regard to them, when he raiſed his Corps, and degraded him after his death, and cut off the Fingers he uſed in Ordinations; and *Sergius* the Third proceeds yet further, and not only raiſes his Corps again, but throws it into *Tiber*. I confeſs *Platina in vita Serg.* 3. ſaith, there was a rumour, that the Fiſhers finding his Body, brought it to *Peter*'s Church, and buried it, which as they were doing, the Images in *Peter*'s Church did obeyſance to the dead Body of *Formoſus*; but *Platina* himſelf queſtions the truth of it. If there were a reality therein, how was not Pope *Sergius* the Third ſtricken with remorſe for the injury done to *Formoſus*, the Images of S. *Peter*'s Church giving ſuch a ſignal teſtimony againſt him? As for S. *Dunſtan*, *Thom. Fuller* in his Ch. Hiſt. *cent.* 10. *lib.* 2. *pag.* 128. *Sect.* 12, 13. tells, that he was baniſhed the Court of *England* as a Magician. The Reader may judge of the reſt of his Miracles, by that Romance of his holding the Devil by the Noſe with a pair of Fiery Pincers; but the *Legerdemain* trick which he was ſaid to uſe againſt the poor Secular Prieſts at *Calne* in *Wiltſhire*, was moſt pernicious, they being at a great Debate with the Monks whom *Dunſtan* owned againſt the Seculars, it's reported he had ſo ordered, that the Timber ſhould fall on the Seculars, and deſtroy them, to terminate the Debate. If theſe be the Romiſh Miracles, the good Lord preſerve us from them: The ſtory of that Magician Saint is largely related by *Fuller*. It ſeems they muſt be ſcarce of Real Miracles, when among the Workers of them they reckon *Greg.* 7. ſeditious *Hildebrand*, whom Cardinal *Benno* holds for a Magician; did it not ſavour more of Magick, than of Apoſtolick Miracles, to ſhake fire out of his Gown-ſleeves. A world of noiſe is made concerning the Miracles of *Malachy*, whom they call *the Apoſtle of* Ireland, *whoſe life is ſaid to be written by* Bernard. It's not without cauſe that D. *Morton*'s *Appeal*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 18. doubts whether theſe things were really done by

Malachias, or recorded by *Bernard*; ſometimes the Writer of theſe Miracles compares him to *Elias*, too high an Elogy, doubtleſs: at other times, he attributes to him ludibrious Miracles, as *operum Bernardi col.* 1942. *edit. Pariſ.* 1615. that he turned *equum runcinum & ſubnigrum*, a ruſty brown Jade, *in pretioſum & album palefridum*, into a choiſe white Palfrey; neither is there more credit to be given to the pretended Miracles of *Bernard* reported in his life; for *Bernard* himſelf confeſſes in *Serm. de Benedict. col.* 121. that he wrought no Miracle. And among the miracles aſcribed to him in his life, ſome are really ludibrious; as *col.* 1981. that he killed Fleas by Excommunication; and that by ſaying a piece of the Lords Prayer, he made a Horſe that had broke his Bridle, and run away into a Meadow, return of his own accord; that he had driven away the Devil from a Woman whom the Devil had carnally uſed many years, by laying his Staff by her in the night; that he excommunicated the Devil, and thereby diſabled him from medling in this ſort any more with Women.

It's tedious to me to tranſcribe the impoſterous Cheats of S. *Francis*, S. *Dominick*, *Katherine* of *Siena*, *&c.* the Cheats of theſe diſſembling Hypocrites having been ſo often laid open to the World. Concerning *Dominick*, I remit the Reader to *Hoſpin lib.* 6. *de Monachis cap.* 7. *fol.* 199. Concerning *Francis* to the ſame Author, *ibid. cap.* 13. *fol.* 214. Concerning *Katherine* of *Siena*, to him likewiſe, *cap.* 41. *fol.* 258. Is it not ludibrious to hear, that Chriſt Jeſus in the preſence of the *Virgin Mary*, *John* and *Paul* the Apoſtles, at the requeſt of the Bleſſed Virgin, ſhould have betrothed *Katherine* of *Siena* to himſelf by a Ring, *David* with his Harp making Muſick to the Solemnity? What Chriſtian ears can endure ſuch impious Fables? This Pamphleter here cannot omit *the miraculous tranſlation of the* Virgin Mary's *Houſe to* Loretto. I doubt if there be any more ridiculous Fiction either in *Ovid's Metamorphoſis*, or in *Æſop's Fables*. It would be perhaps a divertiſement to the Reader to hear the Narration; but ſeeing theſe Papers are ſwelling to a nimious bigneſs, I muſt remit the Reader to *Hoſpin de Templis*, *pag.* 394. Excellently doth *Crakanthorp defenſ. Eccleſ. Anglic. cap.* 66. *Sect.* 14. compare it to that Mahumetan Romance, that when the Temple of *Mecca* (where *Mahomets* Tomb is) was to be built, all the adjacent Hills did bring ſtones thither of their own accord.

Among

Among all theſe Legends of Fictitious Miracles, ſhall *Jeſuits* have no ſhare? It had not been for the Honour of the Society, that the Pamphleter had forgotten *Ignatius Loyola*, and *Xavier*, *Alphonſus de Vargas de ſtratagem. Jeſuit. c.* 2, 3. gives them this teſtimony, that never a Generation among Mortals was more impudent in obtruding impoſterous lyes on the world than Jeſuits, which the Author confirms by remarkable inſtances; nay, ſo ingenious are they in ſuch devices, they could hold the world in hand with a miraculous impreſs of *Garnet*'s Image upon a Straw at his execution. But not to digreſs from *Loyola* and *Xavier*, I cannot deny that *Maffeius* and *Ribadeneira* Jeſuits, report ſtrange Miracles of *Ignatius Loyola*, as *that he would hang in the Air with a wondrous ſplendour, that he did with corporal eyes behold Chriſt in the Sacrament, yea, and the Trinity; that Chriſt and the* Virgin Mary *often appeared to him; that he would beat the Devil with a Rod, and conjure him with a Letter; that he would behold the Souls of dying Jeſuits aſcending to Heaven, that he hath helped Women in hard labour, and thoſe that have been ſmitten with the Peſtilence, and other grievous diſeaſes*; as if *Ignatius* were to make a Monopoly of the imployment of other petty Saints, ſuch as Saint *Roch*, who did Patronize them who had the Plague; Saint *Coſmas* and *Damian*, the Patron of Phyſitians, *&c.* yea and of Saint *Lucina* alſo, who among Romaniſts ſucceeded the Heatheniſh *Juno*, for helping Women in Labour. Perhaps alſo he may intrude upon Saint *Apolinaris* work for curing the *French Pox*. But among the many Cures he is ſaid to have wrought, I never heard that he could cure himſelf of his lameneſs; however, it cannot be denied, but great things are aſcribed to him; but the miſery is, theſe Miracles, as *Hoſpin.* obſerves, *Hiſt. Jeſuit. lib.* 1. *cap.* 1. *pag.* 6. have the atteſtation of no eye-witneſs; therefore *Maffeius* alledges no Author; *Ribadeneira* ſaith, he had them from *Wilhelmus Conſalvus*, another Jeſuit, to whom he affirmed *Ignatius* had revealed them; and cannot *Quakers* give as good Credentials as theſe for their Revelations and Viſions? Hereupon, running over *Maffeius de vita Ignatii*, I found that he did not ſo much as pretend, that there were any Spectators of many of the wondrous things attributed to *Ignatius*. And though of others he would inſinuate there had been witneſſes, yet he relates the matter with ſuch palpable Sophiſtry, that he gives no more ſatisfaction to the Judicious,

ous, than if he had hinted at none: As for inſtance, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 7. it's ſaid, *that ſome beheld* Ignatius *in prayer elevated about four Cubits from the ground, and his face like another* Moſes *ſhining.* But who theſe ſome were is not told. Again, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 14. it's ſaid Ignatius *raiſed from death to life a man who had hanged himſelf, yet* (ſo ſhort-lived was the Jeſuits Miracle, that) *he lived no longer than he confeſſed his ſins to a Prieſt.* To atteſt this, ſaith *Maffeius, ſuperſunt hodie qui meminerunt, à quibus ego id ipſum Sermone diligenter quæſivi*; *i. e.* there be perſons yet alive who remember this, of whom I have diligently enquired the ſame. But he not only forgets to tell who the perſons were, but alſo what Anſwer was given to him by thoſe of whom he enquired concerning this thing. Not to ſpeak that there is no Evidence given that the man was thoroughly dead, whereof one may juſtly doubt, *Ignatius* coming ſo timely as to cut with his own hand, *pendentem ex infelici ligillo reſtim*; yea, ſome of the Wonders attributed to him, are manifeſtly ludibrious; as *lib.* 3. *cap.* 5. *that* Ignatius *was taught by a Miracle to play dexterouſly at the Bouliards.* And *lib.* 3. *cap.* 2. *that he had tears at command*; a Miracle that I have oft heard cunning Whores, and many other pretended Hypocrites, to be gifted with. Of Jeſuit *Xaviers* Miracles alſo in the *Indies* much talk hath been; but many things likewiſe derogate credit from them, *Hoſpin Hiſt. Jeſuit. lib.* 2. *cap.* 3. *fol.* 138. judges it incredible, that *Xavier* ſhould have wrought Apoſtolick-like Miracles, ſeeing he mentions none of them in his own Epiſtles; and the rather, he writing of ſome Myſteries of Nature, which he obſerved there, as of an high Goat giving ſuck to a Kid. Yea, though *Maffeius* the Jeſuit talk much of *Xaviers* Miracles, yet *lib.* 14. *Hiſt. Ind. pag.* 625. ſaith, *Quod tamen ut fateretur ipſe, quanquam graviſſimorum hominum prece fatigatus adduci non potuit*; *i. e.* that he could never be induced, though much importuned by many, to confeſs that he wrought any Miracle. Do Jeſuits uſe to be guilty of ſuch ſelf-denial, or modeſty, when the honour of their Church and Society is concerned? Had *Xaverius* ſo much need of any Miracle among the *Indies*, as of the Gift of Tongues, yet that he wanted, as *Hoſpin lib. cit. fol.* 139. brings him in, confeſſing in one of his Epiſtles, and rendring this as the reaſon why he and his Followers were not able to convert the *Indians*: *Joſephus à Caſiro*, a Jeſuit who lived long in the *Weſt-Indies*, *lib.* 4. *de*

proc.

proc. Ind. Sal. cap. 4. makes this ingenuous confeſſion, *Signa certe non edimus*, ſurely we work no Miracles. Is it then probable that the *East-Indian* Jeſuits wrought ſo many; yea, *à Coſta lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. diſputes the queſtion in general, *why Miracles are not wrought now for the Converſion of the Nations, as of old by the Apoſtles*; and determines, *quod priſcis temporibus omnino neceſſaria fuerint, noſtris non item*, that Miracles were neceſſary in ancient times, but not now; yea, he brings *Chryſoſt.* ſaying, *utilius eſſe ſignis nunc carere*, that it is more profitable now to want Miracles.

I will not blot Paper with the *dotage of* Lipſius *about the Miracles wrought by the Images of the Virgin at* Hales *and* Sichem; undoubtedly they were either dreams of his old age, or cunning Impoſtures of Devils, or of ſubtil men. If God had wrought ſo many Miracles, as he relates, to confirm Image-worſhip, is it like that he would have wrought none in the firſt three Ages of Chriſtianity? or if then he did work Miracles to prove Image-worſhip, would not the Fathers have had as much faithfulneſs and zeal as *Lipſius*, to have tranſmitted them to Poſterity? I deny not to *Lipſius* his skill in Grammar, but of his Piety, or skill in Divinity, I have not read much. I muſt remember this Pamphleter to give a more perfect account in the next, of his *Polonian Miracle*; *by which*, he ſaith, *one was raiſed to life after he had been ſeven years dead, and brought before the King to witneſs that he had ſold ſuch a piece of Land to the Church.* But he hath forgotten to tell us the Hiſtorian who did relate it, or by whom the Miracle was wrought, or who the Man was that was raiſed. Did he not conſider there might be a doubt raiſed, whether that Spectre were a *Meridianus Dæmon*, a Noon-tide Devil, in humane ſhape? He will adviſe in his next to clear this. If the man were raiſed to verifie a Vendition of Land, what is that to the preſent Controverſie of Religion? only he atteſted, that the Land was ſold to the Church. All that I can conclude from this is, that the pretended Miracles of Monks and Fryars are done upon a lucrative account. I look on this Romance like the fictitious Miracles of the *Polonian Saint Hiacinth*, at whoſe Tomb a Maid having made ſupplication for a Heifer, which had died through ſome accident; when ſhe returns home, a Butcher fleying the Heifer, it firſt began to ſtir the fleyed foot, and then to lift up, and at laſt to riſe up as

found

ſound as ever it was: So *Beard* out of *Severinus, de vita & Miraculis Hiacinthi.* It were tedious to rake further in this dunghill of Fabulous Miracles: I acknowledge he might have filled a Volumn with ſuch ſtuff from *Baronius, Surius, Antoninus, Vincentius*, their Legends, *Portuſei* Promptuaries, and Feſtivals of Saints. This touch, as to his inſtances, may ſuffice.

Yet let it fourthly be conſidered, that the late Romiſh Miracles *are queſtioned not by Proteſtants only, but alſo by their own Authors*; *as by* Lyranus *in* cap. 14. Daniel *in* Eccleſia populus ſæpe decipitur à ſacerdotibus fictis miraculis lucri cauſa, *and* Melchior Canus, lib. 11. cap. 6. pag. 333. *confeſſes their Authors forge ſo many Miracles, that he was aſhamed of them.* The ſame is regrated by *Vives*, and *Polydore, Virgil*, by the *Germans* in their *centam gravamina art.* 7. *Gerſon de ſecta flagellantium* (as is noted by *Gerard*) ſaith, *that Miracles are now to be ſuſpected, the World in its decrepit Age being abuſed by the fancies of lying Miracles, as old doting men are with Dreams.*

It would fifthly be conſidered, that *Heathens can pretend to as ſpecious Miracles as the Popiſh Church.* Doth not *Tacitus Hiſt. lib.* 4. report how *Veſpaſian* the Emperour cured one Blind, another Lame? Doth not *Auſtin lib.* 10. *de civit. Dei cap.* 16. relate a multitude of Heatheniſh Miracles, as that a Veſtal Virgin did draw water with a Sieve to prove her Chaſtity, that *Claudia*, tying a Ship to her Girdle, drew it after her, which neither men nor Oxen could remove by all their ſtrength? Is it not reported by *Ælian de animalibus lib.* 9. *cap.* 33. that *Æſculapius* reſtored a woman to life after her Head was cut off? Doth not *Auſtin Epiſt.* 5. talk much of the miracles of *Apollonius, Thyaneus*, and *Apuleius*? Hath not *Philoſtratus* wrote Eight Books of the miracles of *Apollonius*, inſomuch that *Hierocles* dared blaſphemouſly to prefer them to the glorious Miracles of our Bleſſed Saviour? Did not the *Donatiſts* ſo much glory in their miracles, that *Auſtin* called them *tract.* 13. *in Joh. mirabiliorios?* If it be anſwered with *Bell. they were but lying wonders, that the Devil ſat upon the Eye of one, and the Leg of another*, whom Veſpaſian *is ſaid to have cured, that when he cruſed to annoy, he might ſeem miraculouſly to cure.* It would be remembred, the ſame may be replyed concerning the Romiſh Legendary Miracles. An exact parallel may be ſeen betwixt Popiſh and Heatheniſh Miracles in *Crakanthorp defenſ. Eccleſ. Anglic. contra Spalat. cap.* 66. Pagans

ma-

may as ſoon prove the truth of their miracles, as Romaniſts of their late Legendary Romances. Who can ſet limits to the Almighty, that he ſhall not work miracles for the good of mankind without his Church? Miracles therefore cannot be a reciprocal note of the Church. Ought not Romaniſts at leaſt to remember *Bellarmin*'s Reply, concerning the Miracle wrought by a Novatian Biſhop, *lib. de notis Eccleſ. cap.* 14. *Factum eſſe non in confirmationem fidei Novatianæ, ſed Catholici Baptiſmi.* Why may not Proteſtants likewiſe anſwer, if any Real Miracles have been wrought by Romaniſts, ſuch as *Xavier*, in the *Indies* theſe were not wrought to confirm Popiſh Errours, but the common Principles of Chriſtianity

But ſixthly, *Hath ever God promiſed, that the Church in all Ages ſhould enjoy ſuch a gift of Miracles, that no Society ſhould be acknowledged for a true Church, which is not confirmed by preſent Miracles?* I find no Scripture ſaying ſo, but on the contrary, cautioning us, that we be not ſeduced by the lying ſigns and wonders of Seducers, *Matth.*24. 24, 25. eſpecially of Antichriſt, 2 *Theſſ.*2.9. *Revel.* 13. 13, 14. Did not Romaniſts pretend to Miracles? The See of *Rome* ſhould want one of the ſigns of the Great Antichriſt. Ancient Fathers believed not a perpetual neceſſity of Miracles; ſaith not S. *Auſtin* expreſly, *lib.* 22. *de Civ. Dei cap.* 22. *Poſſem dicere neceſſaria fuiſſe prius quam mundus crederet, ad hoc ut crederet mundus: quiſquis adhuc prodigia ut credat requirit, magnum eſt ipſe prodigium qui mundo credente non credit.* Will ye not at leaſt regard *Greg. Hom.* 29. *in Evang. We uſe*, ſaith he, *to water young Plants when they be new ſet, which watering then ceaſeth after that they have taken root; ſo were Miracles neceſſary for the firſt Seed-plot of the Church, to the ſound rooting of multitudes in the Faith.* To the like purpoſe ſpeaks *Chryſoſt. Hom.* 23. in *Joh.* Is it not acknowledged by many Romiſh Doctors, that now there is no neceſſity of Miracles, except it were for the converſion of Infidels? For this *Eſpencæus*, *Delrio*, *Raffenſis*, and *Joſephus à Coſta*, are cited by D. *Morton Appeal*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 17. *Sect.* 4. to whom *Gerard Seſſ.* 275. adds among the reſt *Cornel. Muſſus*, ſaying, *Hæc ſigna facta ſunt ut Religio plantaretur, nunc autem eâ plantatâ non ſunt neceſſaria.* As alſo their great Preacher *Didacus Stella*, not ſparing to affirm, that Miracles now *damnum potius afferrent, quam commodum*, would rather be hurtful, than profitable.

I cannot but in the ſeventh place remember Romaniſts, *that they take for granted, which Learned Proteſtants will not yield; that there have been no Miracles wrought in the Proteſtant Churches.* If *Melanchon* (ſaith *Whitaker, controv. 2. q. 5. de notis Eccleſ. cap. 12.*) may be credited, who was a faithful and modeſt man, *Luther* was honoured of God to work Miracles. D. *Willet. in Synop. Papiſmi controv. 2. q. 3.* of the fifth note of the Church, records many Miracles wrought by Proteſtants, and that for the converſion of Papiſts. Nor can it but ſeem ſtrange to hear Romaniſts talking ſo much of their Miracles, and yet can work none among us Proteſtants, whom they hold for Hereticks and Infidels; if they can work Miracles, why have they not ſo much compaſſion to our Souls, as to work them before intelligent Proteſtants? One Miracle wrought before our eyes would have more impreſſion, than a thouſand Fabulous Legends of Wonders, pretended to be wrought in the *Indies*, among the *Antipodes*, or in *Utopia*. But this is a ſtrange prejudice againſt their pretended Miracles, they can work none of them before rational Proteſtants. I cannot but record a ſtory of a Nun in *Spain* which was cryed up for Miracles, inſomuch that when *Charles* the Firſt, King of *Great Britain*, then Prince of *Wales*, was there, by the entreaty of the *Infanta*, he was perſwaded to go and ſee her: It was reported to the Prince, ſhe would be ſometimes lifted up into the Air, and be as freſh as a Roſe, although ſhe was furrowed with Age; but ſhe could not do any one Feat before the Prince (although ſhe could never have ſhewed her Miracles in a better time) but the Prince was of too ſtrong Faith for that Spirit ſhe was acted by, and therefore ſhe could ſhew none, but *crede quod habes & habes*. This Relation I have from *Edward Chiſenhale* in his *Catholick Hiſtory* againſt D. *Vane, cap. 7. pag.* 180.

Therefore to ſhut up this diſcourſe of Miracles, whatſoever prodigies are wrought to confirm Doctrines repugnant to clear Scriptures, are lying ſigns and wonders; but Invocation of Saints, Religious Adoration of Images, Croſſes, Relicks, the tranſubſtantiated Preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, Purgatory, *&c.* are all Doctrines repugnant to clear Scripture, as Learned Proteſtants have proved, and I in this Tractate have made good, as I had occaſion; therefore ſurely Romiſh prodigies to confirm theſe are lying ſigns and wonders. Away therefore

fore with that oft repeated *Song from* Hugo de Sancto Victore, *which* Bell. Breerly, Leſſius, *D.* Vane, *and this Pamphleter, with the reſt, do blaſphemouſly chant,* &c. *whereby they change the errour of their Idolatrous Religion, and falſe Miracles, on an holy God.* I far better ſhut up with *Auſtin, lib. de unit. Eccleſ. cap.* 16. *Non dicat ideo verum eſſe, quia illa mirabilia fecit Donatus, amoveantur iſta, vel figmenta fallacium hominum, vel portenta fallacium Spirituum.*

Were the Pamphleters popular flouriſhes, concerning Miracles, reduced to a Syllogiſtick frame, they behoved to run thus: *That Society in which Miracles are wrought, is the true and Catholick Church, but in the Romiſh Church Miracles are wrought;* Ergo, *the Romiſh Church is the true and Catholick Church.* Whatever be of the minor, the major is manifeſtly falſe; for Miracles may be wrought among Hereticks, yea and Infidels. If therefore the Syllogiſm be rectified thus; *The Society in which Miracles are wrought to confirm the ſoundneſs of their Faith, is the true Catholick Church; but Miracles are wrought in the Romiſh Church to confirm the ſoundneſs of her Faith;* Ergo, *&c.* Then firſt the major yet remains falſe, for Miracles may be wrought to confirm the Orthodoxy of the Faith of a particular Church. The major cannot hold, unleſs the Miracles be firſt true; ſecondly, wrought to confirm the Faith of the Society; and thirdly, the Catholiciſm of it, that is, that they have no intereſt in the Church, who ſubmit not to the Government of that Church; and thus I let the major paſs. But then the minor is notoriouſly falſe, *viz.* that in the preſent Romiſh Church true Miracles are wrought to confirm the ſoundneſs of her Faith, and her Catholiciſm, or Univerſal Juriſdiction over all Churches; I appeal all the Jeſuits in *Europe* to make good this Aſſumption, which till they do, all their diſcourſe about Miracles is but a flouriſh. I confeſs in the Ancient Roman Church there were miracles wrought to confirm the truth of her Faith, but not her Catholiciſm, as if ſhe only had been the Chriſtian Church; for ſhe was but a particular Church at beſt, the preſent Romiſh Church hath foully Apoſtatized from the Faith of the Ancient Church, ſearch your Records and Legends to find one true Miracle to confirm the Faith and Catholiciſm of the preſent Romiſh Church; this you will find impoſſible, for her Faith is unſound, and Catholiciſm, in the ſenſe ſpoken of, ſhe never had.

But from this Head of Miracles, I demonſtrate the truth of the Proteſtant Religion thus:

That Religion which is confirmed by the moſt real, indubitate, and glorious Miracles which ever the world had, is ſurely the true Chriſtian-Religion; But the Religion of Proteſtants is confirmed by the moſt real, indubitate, and glorious Miracles which ever the world had; Ergo, *The Religion of Proteſtants is the true Chriſtian Religion.*

The Aſſumption, concerning which only the doubt can be, is proved thus; The Apoſtolick Religion is confirmed by the moſt glorious Miracles that ever the world ſaw; but the Religion of Proteſtants is the Apoſtolick Religion; *Ergo*, the Religion of Proteſtants is confirmed by the moſt real, indubitate Miracles, that ever the world ſaw. The major none can deny but an Infidel; for evidencing the minor, let the Religion of Proteſtants be examined by the Scriptures, which contain the Apoſtolick Religion, and if one Article be found in our Religion diſſonant there-from, we ſhall inſtantly diſown it. The Reader here may obſerve the difference betwixt the Romiſh procedure, and ours; we confirm our Religion by the indubitate Miracles, which prove Chriſtianity it ſelf; they by ſome fabulous, at beſt uncertain Legendary ſtories, the truth whereof is queſtioned by their own Authors, and the falſhood of many detected to the world. If it be ſaid, *that any Heretick may argue as we do, to confirm their Hereſie*, I ſhall not now ſtand to retort, how Hereticks have argued for their Hereſie from pretended Miracles, as do Romaniſts to day: Only to ſhew the diſparity betwixt us and Hereticks, I undertake againſt all the Enemies of Truth in the world, to prove the real conformity of the Reformed Religion with the Apoſtolick revealed in Scripture, and the diſconformity of all Hereſies whatſoever. It's a real conformity with Apoſtolick Doctrine, not pretended only, which proves it to be confirmed by Apoſtolick Miracles.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE II.

Of the Converſion of Infidels.

THe *ſecond Note* whereby this Pamphleter would prove *the Catholiciſm of their Romiſh Church, is, that by her all Chriſtian Nations have been converted to the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt*: And to confirm this, he following *Bell. Breerly*, and the Drove, hints at a multitude of ſtories, which upon examination will be found of no ſignificancy to the point in hand.

For firſt, it's a moſt notorious falſhood, *that all Chriſtian people have been converted by the Romiſh Church*; was the Church of *Jeruſalem* converted by her, or the Church of *Ceſarea*, or of *Antioch*, or the Greek Churches in general? As *Eve* was the Mother of all Living, ſo not the *Roman*; but the Church of *Hieruſalem* may be termed the Mother of all Churches. And ſo ſhe is deſigned by the ſecond General Council at *Conſtantinople*, as witneſſes *Theod. Hiſt. lib.* 5. *cap.* 9. The Biſhop of *Bitontum*, in the Council of *Trent*, acknowledged *Greece* to be the Mother of all that the Latin Church had. Doth not *Theod. lib.* 1. *Hiſt. cap.* 22. report that the *Indians* were converted by *Lay-men*, *Edeſius* and *Frumentius*; and that for carrying on the work, *Frumentius* received Ordination from *Athanaſius*, then Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and not from the Biſhop of *Rome*? The Pamphleter but plays the Cheat, when he alledges, that our Church of *Scotland* owes her firſt Converſion to Pope *Victor*, his Legats and Envoys. The Reader may ſee the falſhood of this proved by Biſhop *Spotſwood*, *Hiſt. pag.* 21. *edit.* 3. Theſe Preachers ſent hither by *Victor*, were ſent upon the entreaty of King *Donald* the Firſt, which the King would not have ſought, had he not been Chriſtian before. If our Converſion had been wrought by Pope *Victor*, how came it that our Church was not faſhioned to the Roman in outward rites, eſpecially in the obſervance of *Eaſter*, whereof *Victor* was but prepoſterouſly zealous? Much more probable looks the conjecture of Biſhop *Spotſwood*, that ſome of *John*'s Diſciples, under the perſecution of *Domitian*, have had their refuge hither, and were inſtruments of planting Chriſtianity among us; and the rather, becauſe this Church was

very

very tenacious of the Oriental Customs, alledging for it the Authority of *John.* However, *Scotland* was very anciently enlightned with the Gospel; hence is that of *Tertul. adversus Judæos cap. 7. Britannorum Romanis inaccessa loca, Christo vero subdita*; and their conformity in rites with the Greek Church, and not with the Latin, shew their Original was not from *Rome.* It is a manifest falshood then, that the Roman Church is the Mother of all, or of our Church of *Scotland.*

But secondly, this Pamphleter deceitfully *confounds and joyns together the endeavours of the Ancient Romish Church for converting of Nations, with the practises of the present Romish Church for Proselyting Countries to the Popish perswasion.* We acknowledge the Roman Church was instrumental in converting many Nations to Jesus Christ; but it was not to the present Romish Faith, that not being then hatched, but to the Christian Faith. The like also was done by other Churches, particularly by the Greek Church. Hence *Ephraim Pagit* in his *Christianography, Edit. 3. pag. 21.* renders this as one reason of the large Jurisdiction of the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, the conversion of many Nations to the Christian Faith by his Suffragans. Therefore, though it were true that *Scotland* did owe her conversion to *Victor*, and *England* to *Eleutherius*, (both which are false; yea, the Gospel was planted in *Britain* some years before it came to *Rome* it self, if *Baronius* story concerning *Joseph* of *Arimathea, ad annum* 35. or *Gildas* testimony, that *Britain* received the Gospel in the end of *Tiberius Cæsar*'s Reign, deserve credit) this makes nothing for the truth of the present Romish Faith, or Catholicism of the present Romish Church, for the Ancient Romish Church declined from the Faith of the present Popish Church, as well as we.

Thirdly, Particular Churches, though not altogether sound in the Faith, but stained with some errours in the integrals of Religion, *may be instrumental in converting Nations*: As a Leprous man may beget Children, he is a man, though not a sound man. In this case it's by vertue of the sound Principles of Christianity retained in these Churches, that they beget Children unto God, and not of their errors; nay, their errors do oft-times deface the work, for with the truths of the Gospel they transmit their errours. Such were these conversions of Nations, wherein the Roman Church had a hand in the intermedial A-

ges)

ges; as those of *Germany* by *Boniface*; For sure it is, that in *Germany* the Gospel had been preached long before the time of that *Boniface*, sent thither by *Greg.* 2. in the eigth Century, as *Baronius ad annum* 690. doth acknowledge; and *Boxhornius in Hist. Universali, pag.* 198. doth prove from *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, that the seeds of the Christian Religion were sown in *Germany* in the second Century; and therefore *pag.* 101. he exhibits Ancient Versions of the Apostolick Creed, both in the *Aleman* and *Saxon* Languages. I shall not say, but by *Boniface* the Gospel hath been propagated in *Germany*, yet surely with many corruptions, wherewith at that time the Roman Church was tainted; and therefore he was zealously opposed by holy men, particularly by *Adelbertus*, *Clemens*, *Sampson*, *Sydonius*, *Virgilius*, as is shewed by the Author of *Catal. test. verit. lib.* 8. *pag.* 755. and *Hottinger Sæc.* 8. *pag.* 527. The like was the case of *Austin* his Conversion of *England*; the Gospel was in *England* long before he came over, and more pure than he preached it, yet it cannot be denied but he was instrumental to convert many, who till that time had retained their Heathenism; but with the Gospel he did also introduce many Superstitions, which were zealously opposed by *British* Christians, for a long time. The converting of Souls to Christ therefore proves not a Church to be sound, far less the Catholick Church. Did not the Jewish Church beget Sons and Daughters to God, when she was defiled with Superstition and Idolatry? yea, have not private persons been instrumental in converting Souls to God, as some Exiled Slaves converted the *Moors* in *Africk*. See *Baron. ad annum* 456. *N.* 4.

But fourthly, It's more evident than can be denied, *that Hereticks and Infidels have prevailed with Nations to be of their perswasion.* Doth not Heresie spread as a Gangrene? 2 *Tim.* 2. 17. *Did not Pharisees compass Sea and Land to make Proselites?* Mat. 23. 15. *though they made them the Children of the Devil more than themselves?* How many Nations have been leavened by *Mahumetanism?* Neither was that done only by force of Arms, as *Bell.* alledges, but also by corrupting the judgments of men; *Mahumetans* believing their *Alcoran* as firmly, as Papists do their *Tridentine* Articles. Is it not told that Antichrist should come with strong delusion, 2 *Thes.* 2. 10, 11. yea, and with such success, that the World should wonder after the Beast? *Revel.* 13. 3. How many Nations

Nations were corrupted by Arrianiſm? Do we not find the Leaven of Socinianiſm, Quakeriſm, &c. prevailing with many? So that the Argument from bringing multitudes to the ſame perſwaſion is very fallacious, unleſs the Faith to which perſons are brought be ſound. And if it muſt be ſuppoſed that the Faith be ſound, before an Argument be forcible from that ground, there muſt be another Evidence for the ſoundneſs of the Faith, than this Pamphleter hath brought. Yea *Freculphus in Chronico Tom. 2. lib. 4. cap.* 20. by the confeſſion of *Bellarmine, lib. 4. de notis Eccleſ. cap.* 14. affirms the whole Nation of the *Goths* to have been converted by the Arrians to the Chriſtian Profeſſion from Heatheniſm in the time of *Valens* the Emperour. Only the Cardinal to enervate this teſtimony of *Freculphus*, alledges from *Socrates lib. 4. cap. 27. Sozom. lib. 6. cap.* 37. and *Theod. lib. 4. cap. ult.* that the greater part of the Goths were firſt converted to the Orthodox Faith, and only afterward perverted by the Arrians to their Hereſie. But on the contrary, *Socrates* declares this to be the ground on which the Goths were willing to accept the Chriſtian Religion, becauſe of the aid which *Valens* had given to *Phritigernes* againſt *Athalaricus*; ſo as he ſeems to agree with *Freculphus*. The outmoſt that the other two, *Theodoret* and *Sozomen* have, is, that *Ulphilas*, the firſt Biſhop of the Goths, while Orthodox, had converted ſome of them to the Orthodox Faith, not the greater part, as *Bellarmine* affirms. So that at leaſt this ſeems clear, that after *Ulphilas* turned Arrian, he not only drew the Chriſtians to the Arrian perſwaſion, but many Heathens alſo to the profeſſion of Chriſt; wherein they were ſo conſtant, that under *Athalaricus*, not a few of them ſuffered death on that account. If therefore Romaniſts aſcribe the Converſion of *Germany* to *Boniface*, of *England* to *Auſtin* the Monk, and of *Scotland* to Pope *Victor*, becauſe by them the Goſpel was propagated in theſe Countries, though not firſt planted, how can they deny, but on the like account, the Converſion of the Goths ought to be aſcribed to the Arrians? Were not the Ruſſians, or Muſcovians, converted to the Chriſtian Religion by the Grecians, as teſtifieth *Barron. ad annum* 867. *N.* 10. when *Photius* was Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, whom Romaniſts hold for a grievous Schiſmatick?

Fifthly, It's a falſhood, *that no Nations have been converted by Proteſtants.*

Proteſtants. How many Nations have imbraced the Truth, and forſaken the Idolatry of Popery, as *Scotland*, *England*, *Ireland*, the *United Provinces* in the *Netherlands*, *Denmark*, *Norway*, *Swedeland*, many people in *Germany*, *France*, *Poland*, *Hungary*, *Tranſylvania*, *&c.* neither ought this to be deſpiſed, though theſe Countries did formerly profeſs Chriſtianity, ſeeing the power of the Goſpel is no leſs reſplendant in the Converſion of Hereticks, than of Infidels. But beſides *Gerard de Eccleſ. cap.* 10. *Sect.* 9. §. 258. teſtifies, that by Proteſtants many thouſands have been converted from Heatheniſm, in *Iſland*, *Greenland*, *Lapland*, *Livonia*, *&c.* Not to mention the many *Indians* converted in *New-England*, and other parts of *America*: But though it were granted that Heathen Nations had not been converted by them, this would only charge Proteſtants of a ſinful negligence, but not prove their Religion to be falſe. Methinks this clamour of Romaniſts againſt our Churches for not beſtirring themſelves more zealouſly for the Converſion of Infidel Nations, ſhould awake Proteſtant Princes, and Churches ſeriouſly to conſider, what may be done for the Converſion of Infidels, both for the advantage of the Goſpel, and to ſtop the mouths of our cavilling Adverſaries.

Sixthly, Any Converſions made by *Romaniſts*, *have been very unlike the Primitive Converſions made by the Apoſtles*; theſe have generally been by force, even theſe made in the intermedial Ages, wanted not force; that of *Boniface* among the *Thuringians*, was done *terrore armorum*, as *Gerard* obſerves *ex Chronico Iſenacenſi*, *Cent.* 8. *Eccleſ. Hiſt. cap.* 10. *Charles the Great* brought the *Saxons* to imbrace the Chriſtian Faith by bloody Wars. But as for the late Romiſh Converſions, which only can be attributed to the preſent Romiſh Church, how bloody have many of them been? Who can read what their own *Bartholomæus de la Caſa* hath written of the proceeding of the *Spaniards* in the *Weſt-Indies* without horrour? Did not a Great Perſon, when a dying, hearing that *Catholick Spaniards* went to Heaven, profeſs he would never go there, if *Spaniards* went thither, judging it could be no good place where ſuch bloody men went. Yea *Granado*, as cited by *Gerard*, *loc. de Eccleſ. cap.* 10. *Sect.* 4. §. 188. confeſſes, *Ea crudelitatis immanitate Hiſpanos erga illos uſos, ut Sanctiſſimum Chriſtiani nomen, non Pietatis & Religionis, ſed crudelitatis & immanitatis nomen habitum ſit*; that is, through their

Barbarity the holy name of Christians became an Epithete of cruelty. As for the *East-Indies*, it's supposed there were some remainders of the Christian Faith among them left by the conversions of these people in ancient times, and the truth of Popish relations concerning conversions there, are justly to be questioned, finding how unfaithful they are in Relations nearer home, whereof I gave a hint *cap.* 3. *Sect.* 4. And besides, their design is to convert them rather to the Pope, and Papal Superstition, than to Jesus Christ: But if any Real Conversion be wrought by them, it's wholly to be attributed to the common Principles of Christianity, yet retained among Papists, but not to any of their Popish errours.

Let the Pamphleter notice these particulars, and then frame an Argument if he can, without Rhetorical declamations, to prove their Church to be the true Catholick and *Infallible* Church.

But I invert also this his second Note, and from it prove the truth of the Protestant Religion, thus: That Religion by which alone Nations have been converted to the true Christian Faith, is the only true Religion; but by the Religion which Protestants hold, Nations have only been converted; *Ergo.* I prove the Assumption by the Apostolick Religion, Nations have only been converted to the true Faith, but the Religion of Protestants is the Apostolick Religion, and we own none else. Let theirs and ours be compared if they be not the same, *Ergo*, by the Religion of Protestants Nations have only been converted. If any again say, *that a Quaker, or other Heretick, may make the same Argument*, it hath been answered already. Let matters be brought to tryal by Scriptures, which contain the Apostolick Religion, and it shall be found, our Religion, and not theirs, is the true Apostolick Religion: And we have this strong presumption for us against both Papists and Quakers, neither of them dare refer the Controversie to the decision of Scripture, the one running to an infallible visible Judge, the other to an infallible Light within. But we remit all to the decision of Scriptures, which Christians of all perswasions acknowledge to be of Divine Inspiration, yet it's not by presumptions we would deal, but by a particular examination of Controversies; let their Cause only prevail, who have real conformity with Scriptures.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE III.

Of Sanctity of Life.

THe *third Note of the Church* brought by this Jeſuit, is taken *from the pretended Sanctity of Romaniſts Lives*: But beſides, that Sanctity of Life is no ſolid Note of the true viſible Church; there is nothing to which Romaniſts have leſs ground to pretend.

I ſay firſt, *it's no ſolid Note of the viſible Church*: For either they ſpeak of real internal Sanctity, and Heart-Renovation, or of external and apparent Sanctity. If of the firſt, though undoubtedly the Church has always a Remnant of truly Holy Ones, yet internal holineſs cannot be infallibly diſcerned by others, and ſo much *Bell.* himſelf acknowledges, *lib.* 3. *de Eccleſ. cap.* 10. yea Romaniſts deny that a man can be infallibly certain of his own Sanctity. If therefore he ſpeak only of external and apparent Sanctity, it's not peculiar to the Church, Hypocrites and pernicious Hereticks may have it; are we not told, *that falſe Teachers may come in Sheeps cloathing*, Matth. 7. 15. *that they ſpeak lyes in hypocriſie*, 1 Tim. 4. 2. *that they have a form of godlineſs*, 2 Tim. 3. 5. *that the Miniſters of Satan transform themſelves into Miniſters of Righteouſneſs*, 2 Cor. 11, 12. *Did not Phariſees make long prayers?* Mat. 23. 24. Are they not, on this account, reſembled to painted Sepulchres? *verſ.* 22. Did not *Bell. lib.* 5. *de lib. arb. cap.* 10. confeſs, that by the works of Teachers we cannot paſs a ſure judgment on their Doctrine, becauſe their inward works are not ſeen, and the external works are common both to ſound and unſound Teachers? Did not the *Novatians* pretend to ſo much Sanctity, that they would appropriate to themſelves the Name of *Cathari*, as teſtifies *Auſtin de Hæreſ. cap.* 38. Who pretended more external Sanctity than the *Pelagians?* See *Hieron. lib.* 3. *adverſ. Pelag.* Were not *Donatiſts* ſuch pretenders to Sanctity, that they denied a Church to be where there were any wicked? See *Alphonſus à Caſtro adverſ. Hæreſ. tit. Eccleſ.* Doth not *Auſtin* teſtifie, *lib.* 1. *de moribus Eccleſ. cap.* 1. that the very *Manichees* deceived many by the ſeeming Sanctity of their lives? Do not *Socinians*, who

hardly deſerve the Name of Chriſtians, pretend to much Sanctity, as alſo our deluded Quakers? Will Antichriſt himſelf want his pretenſions to Sanctity? *Hath not the Beaſt two Horns like the Lamb?* Revel. 12. 11. *Hath not the Whore a Golden Cup in her hand?* that is, ſhe guilds over her Abominations with the ſpecious pretences of Piety? It were indeed to be wiſhed that all the Lords People were holy; yet alas, how oft hath the Real Church of God been overgrown with ſcandals? Are not the complaints of the Prophets on this account known, *Micah* 7. 1. &c. *Ezek. cap.* 16. *cap.* 22. and *cap.* 36. Doth not the Apoſtle complain alſo of Goſpel Churches? as 2 *Cor.* 12. 20, 21. Doth not *Euſebius lib.* 8. *Hiſt. cap.* 1. hold out the wicked lives of Chriſtians, yea and of Miniſters, to be the cauſe of the grievous perſecution under *Dioclefian?* Hereupon Ancients would not have the truth of Doctrine examined by mens lives. *Hieron lib.* 3. *cont. Ruffin. Quis unquam Catholicorum in diſputatione Sectarum, turpitudinem ei objecit, adverſus quem diſputat.* Aud *Auſtin lib.* 1. *de mor. Eccleſ. cap.* 34. *Nunc vos illud admoneo, ut aliquando Eccleſiæ Catholicæ male dicere deſinatis, vituperando mores hominum, quos & ipſa condemnat, & quos quotidie tanquam malos filios corrigere ſtudet.* What need I more to compeſce this Pamphleter, ſeeing *Stapleton* himſelf, *lib.* 1. *de Princip. Doct. cap.* 19. confeſſes *Sanctam eſſe Eccleſiam, ſed per ſuam Sanctitatem non innoteſcere.* Did not *Tertull. de præſcript.* long ago teach, that we muſt meaſure perſons by Doctrines, *non ex perſonis fidem?*

It were the wiſdom of Romaniſts to be ſilent, as to this matter, were I diſpoſed to write a *Satyr.* I might fill a Volumn with complaints of the impiety of the Romiſh Church, and that out of their own Authors. Did not their own Pope *Hadrian* the Sixth, in his inſtructions to *Chregat* his *Nuncio* to the Diet at *Noremberg* confeſs, *that the Church of* Rome *was greatly corrupted, that the evil flowed from the Prieſts to the people, and from the Top of the Pontifical Dignity to the inferiour Clergy, inſomuch that no man did aright.* See Hiſt. of the Council of *Trent*, by *Padre Paulo*, *lib.* 1. *pag.* 26. *Edit.* 2. and *Sleid. Comment. lib.* 4. How oft have they been told of the ruthful complaint of their *Eſpencæus Comment. in Tit.* 1. *Ubi ſub ſole malorum omnium licentia, &c.* where more licentiouſneſs, in all manner of wickedneſs, than at *Rome? Tanta ut credat nemo, niſi qui viderit, ut neget nemo, niſi qui non viderit*; and thereupon cites the lines of their own Poet *Mantuan.*

Vivere

Vivere qui cupit, Sancte, discedito Roma,
Omnia cum liceant, non licet esse Pium.

Doth not *Platina* tell in *vita Marcellini*, *vitia nostra eò crevere, ut vix apud Deum nobis locum veniæ reliquerint?* Who would see a multitude of such like grievous complaints of *Romes* impiety from *Theodoricus à Niem*, *Cornelius Mussus*, *Bernard*, *Marsilius*, *Jansenius* of *Gaunt*, *&c.* I remit them to *John White*, his way to the Church, *Sect.* 38. §. 31. and to *Gerard de notis Eccles. Sect.* 10. It's irksome to me to give an account what execrable Monsters many of their Popes have been. Is not *Sergius* the Second stigmatized by *Baronius Anno* 908. *Num.* 2. as *vir nefandus*, *&c.* a most vicious man? Did he not upon a most notorious Strumpet *Marozia*, beget Pope *John* the Eleventh, whom *Baronius Anno* 931. deservedly terms a Monster? What another Monster was *John* the Twelfth, whom *Platina* calls *John* the Thirteenth? did he not possess the Papal Chair, according to *Baronius*, *Anno* 955. *N.* 4. about eighteen years of Age? one from his Youth, saith *Platina*, defiled with all vice and turpitude. Doth not *Onuphrius Annot. in Plat.* in *John* 8. enumerate a multitude of Whores which he kept, as *Joanna*, *Rayneria*, *Stephana*, *&c.* so that he turned the Palace of the Lateran to a Stew? *Luitprand* reports of him, that in Dicing he would call upon the Devil for help, and drink Healths to the Devil. *Platina* affirms, that he did cut off Noses and Hands of Cardinals; and adds from others, that while he was lying with another Mans Wife, he was stabbed to Death in the Act of Adultery. *Luitprand* says, he died of a wound given him by the Devil in his filthiness: Yet *Baronius loc. cit.* confesses, that the whole Catholick Church did venerate this impure Wretch as Pope of *Rome*. Concerning *Boniface* the Seventh, doth not *Baronius Anno* 985. *N.* 1, 2. write, that he was a very Villain, a Church-Robber, and Murderer of two Popes, so that he would have his name blotted out among Popes. If all the impious Monsters were razed out, there would be a great *Hiatus* in their succession. Had not *Innocent* the Eigth sixteen Bastards? Hence are these lines

Octo Nocens pueros genuit, totidemque puellas,
Hunc merito poterit dicere Roma *Patrem.*

Was not *Sixtus* the Fourth a Sodomite, and gave License for that Abomination to his Cardinals for three hot Moneths; and as *Cornelius Agrippa* witnesses, erected a Brothel-house at *Rome*.

O execrable! for both kinds of Venery. Hence was that Epitaph on him.

Sixte jaces tandem, deflent tua busta Cinædi,
Scortaque, lenones, alea, vina, Venus.

Alexander the Sixth comes nothing behind him, he came to the Papacy by Simony, a man of barbarous cruelty, insatiable avarice, he sold Cardinals Hats for money; yea, as *Onuphrius* writes, poysoned Cardinals that he might seize on their Treasures; by which means, through a mistake of the Poysoned Cup designed for others, himself was poysoned: Most licentious in his Lust; he did not like other Popes, make his Bastards go under the name of Nephews, but owned them as his Children; both himself, and his Son, did incestuously converse with his own Daughter *Lucretia*: Hence were the lines.

Hic jacet in tumulo Lucretia *nomine, sed re*
Thais, Alexandri *filia, Sponsa, nurus.*

Have you not heard how Pope *Paul* the Third did prostitute his Sister *Julia Farnesia* to *Alexander* the Sixth, that he might be made Cardinal; and how himself incestuously abused his own Niece *Laura Farnesia*, and her Husband deprehending him in the Act, wounded him with a Dagger? And this is that Holy Pope who first authorized the unhallowed Order of Jesuits. What should I speak of *John* 23. who was commonly called an Incarnate Devil, and was accused by the Council of *Constance* as an Infidel, who denied the Immortality of the Soul, and the Resurrection; or of *Leo* the Tenth, who in a Discourse with *Bembus*, called the Gospel a Fable. Doth not *Baronius* confess *ad Annum* 908. that notorious Strumpets put out, and in Popes at their pleasure. Lest I should rake too long in this Puddle, let the confession of *Marcellus* the Second suffice for all, who, as *Onuphrius* relates, *openly professed he could not see how any that possessed that Chair could be saved.* Had he lived longer, it's like he might have used more freedom, but he died within 22 days after his Election, and, as is supposed, not without an Italian Potion.

But perhaps the Sanctity of the Romish Church *is cloystered up within their Monasteries*: Hath not the World heard of many thousand Infants murdered in their Cloysters, their bones buried in Privies and Ponds? Doth that speak out their Piety? But I rather they take a Character of the Sanctity of their Monaste-

ries

ries from their own Writers, than me. Who would have an impartial account hereof, I commend to them the perusal of *Nicolaus de Clemanges*, who lived 200 years ago, and upwards, his Book *de corrupto Eccleſiæ ſtatu.* I ſhall only mention two paſſages; the one, *cap.* 22. where he compares the *Mendicant* Fryars to the Phariſees, and affirms them to be *ravening Wolves in ſheeps cloathing, who in words pretend the forſaking of the world, but in deeds, with all poſſible deceit and lying, hunt after it, making ſemblance in outward ſhew of Auſterity, Chaſtity, Humility, but ſecretly in exquiſite Delicates, and variety of Pleaſures, going beyond the Luxuriouſneſs of all worldly men, and like Bell's Prieſts, devouring the Oblations of the People, though not with their Wives, yet with their Brats, &c.* The other, *cap.* 23. where of Nuns, *Shame* (ſaith he) *forbiddeth me to ſpeak of them, leſt I ſhould mention not a company of Virgins dedicated to God, but ſhewed, deceitful, impudent Whores, with their fornications and inceſtuous works; for what, I pray you, are Nunneries now adays, but the execrable Brothel-houſes of* Venus, *the Herbonats of wanton young men, where they ſatisfie their Luſt. That now the Veiling of a* Nun *is all one, as if you proſtituted her to be a Whore.* Yet a worſe Character may be had of them from *Agrippa de Van. Scient. cap.* 62. Hence *Pol. Virg. de invent. lib.* 7. *cap.* 5. wiſhed, *that theſe dregs of men were cut off, that with their filth they might no longer defile the Worſhip of God.* Was it not on the like account that *Mantuan*, an Italian Monk, made theſe lines?

Roma ipſa lupanar
Reddita, feminea Petri domus oblita Luxu,
Ad ſtygias olet uſque Lares, inceſtat Olympum.
Nidore hoc facta eſt toto execrabilis Orbe.

Watſon the Secular Prieſt, *quod libet* 3. *art.* 4. *pag.* 31. charges Jeſuits as maintaining that Magiſtrates may lawfully permit Publick Stews, or Brothel-houſes; yea, ſo much is poſitively aſſerted by *Bell. lib.* 2. *de Amiſſ. gra. cap.* 18. And no wonder they being openly tolerated at *Rome*, and a conſiderable Revenue accruing thereby to the Pope. *Gerard Loc. de Lege cap.* 4. *Sect.* 9. *memb.* 6. *Sect.* 162. relates from *Stanislaus Orichovius*, and *Hieronymus Marius*, that Pope *Paul* 3. had 45000 Whores in his Rolls, from whom he had a Monethly Tribute; yea *Agrippa de Van. Scient. cap.* 64. and the *Germans Gravam.* 75. and 91. affirm, that the Prieſts do annually pay a Concubinary Tribute. May

not

not theſe men ceaſe to boaſt of the Holineſs of their Church, except in ſuch a ſenſe as *Petrus Damiani* in *Baron. Anno* 1061. *N.* 5. ſaid that *Hildebrand*, afterward Pope *Greg.* 7. might be called Holy, but a Holy Devil.

Leaving this charge of Perſonal Ungodlineſs, that I may ſtrike at the Root of the Cauſe, I argue thus; That Religion, whoſe Principles have a manifeſt tendency to Ungodlineſs, cannot be the true Chriſtian Religion; but the Principles of the Popiſh Religion, and more eſpecially as maintained by Jeſuits, have a manifeſt tendency to unholineſs; *Ergo*, the Popiſh Religion, and more eſpecially as maintained by Jeſuits, cannot be the true Chriſtian Religion. The major is evident; the true Chriſtian Religion being *a Doctrine according to Godlineſs*, *Tit.* 1. 1. The Aſſumption might be confirmed by many inſtances; *Gerard* the *Lutheran*, *Loc. de Eccleſ. Cap.* 10. *Sect.* 8. draws a large Catalogue of impious Popiſh Tenets, contrary to the Articles of the Apoſtolick Creed, and to the Commands of the Decalogue: I will only hint at a few, which yet I hope ſhall ſuffice to prove the thing.

Inſtance 1. The Popiſh Religion teaches *manifold groſs Idolatry*; as 1. To give the *Supreme worſhip due to God*, *to that*, *which after Conſecration*, *is eaten in the Euchariſt*; as is defined in the Council of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 13. *cap.* 5. But that which after Conſecration is eaten is proper real Bread, as I proved *cap.* 5. *Sect.* 1. and the ſenſes of all men declare, nor can they avoid the guilt of Idolatry, by ſaying they adore the Euchariſtick Bread, as ſuppoſing it to be God; elſe the Heathens worſhipping the Sun, or Devil, and ſuppoſing them to be God, ſhould be abſolved from Idolatry alſo. Secondly, Popery teaches *to give the ſame Supreme worſhip of Latry to the Croſs*. This is not only the common Opinion of Romiſh Doctors, as teſtifies *Azorius*, *Part.* 1. *Inſtit. Moral. lib.* 9. *cap.* 6. but if we may believe *Aquinas*, *Part.* 3. *q.* 25. *art.* 4. it's the Doctrine of the Romiſh Church; and that it is ſo, Learned *Dallæus lib.* 5. *de object. cult. Religioſ. cap.* 3. confirms by many Evidences from the Roman Pontifical, Miſſals, and Breviaries. If he be not an Idolater, who gives the Supreme worſhip of *Latria* to a piece of Wood, or Stone, or Silver in ſhape of a Croſs, I pray who is? Thirdly, Popery teaches that *Religious worſhip is to be given to Images*; yea, if we may credit *Azorius loc. cit.* it's the common Sentiment of Romiſh

miſh Doctors, that the ſame Religious worſhip is to be given to Images, and to the Prototipe, and conſequently the Images of Chriſt, and of the Trinity, are to be adored with *Latria*. If any will ſay, that Images are not properly to be adored, but only the Prototipe before the Image, *Bell.* ſpares not *lib. de Imag. cap.* 21. to aſſert, that they are Anathematized by the ſecond Council of *Nice*, *Act.* 7. The impiety of this Doctrine is ſuch, that *Bell. lib. cit. cap.* 22. adviſes, that it be ſparingly ſpoken of, *in concionibus ad populum*. Fourthly, Popery teaches *that Saints and Angels are to be Religiouſly adored and invocated*, as is defined in the Council of *Trent Seſſ.* 25. *Decret. de Invocat. &c.* to Saints they kneel, they erect Temples, and Altars, they pray, they ſwear by them, offer Incenſe to them, they celebrate Maſſes to their honour, they aſcribe to them, eſpecially to the *Virgin Mary*, Titles full of Blaſphemy, whereof *Stembergius in Idea Papiſmi, Part.* 1. *Sect.* 3. *cap.* 1. hath collected an Epitome, ſuch as, *The Ocean of the Deity, the Complement of the Trinity, the Savioureſs of the World, the Queen of Heaven, the Author of Grace, to whom from God it is lawful to appeal, &c.* Though to other Saints ſuch high Titles be not aſcribed, yet to them alſo they give Religious Worſhip proper to God alone. Hence Bell. *lib.* 3. *de Cult. Sanct. cap.* 9. renders this reaſon why they make Vows to Saints, becauſe they are *Dii per participationem*, Gods by participation. Is not their Canonization of Saints called *Apotheoſis*, a kind of Deification? Fifthly, Popery alſo teaches, that *it's lawful to give Religious Adoration to the Relicks of Saints*; to their Bones, their Fleſh, their Blood, their Teeth, their Hair, their Nails, their Cloaths, their Shoes, their Combs, their Whips, *&c.* So the Council of *Trent* in the laſt cited Decree, and *Vaſq.* in 3. *Part. q.* 25. *diſp.* 112. How groſly ſuperſtitious the Romiſh Church is in the Adoration of Relicks, *Dallæus* deſcribes *Lib.* 4. *de object. Cult. Religioſ. cap.* 9. I might add as a ſixth branch of Romiſh Idolatry, *the Adoration of the Popes*, of whom ſays the *Lateran Council* under *Leo* the Tenth, *Seſſ.* 3. *&c.* 10. *Eſt univerſis populis adorandus, & Deo ſimillimus*; and withal applies to him that Scripture, *Pſa.* 72. *Adorabunt eum omnes Reges terræ.* Among other examples of adoring Popes, *Stembergius* in *Idea Papiſmi, pag.* 98. makes mention, how in the Conclave, immediately after the Creation of a new Pope, he is adorned with Holy Veſtments, and a Triple Crown, and ſet upon an Altar;

then the Cardinals kneeling, and kiſſing his hands and his feet, do Religiouſly adore him; and this by the *Italians* is by way of Eminence, ſays mine Author, called *L' adoratione.* To ſhut up this firſt inſtance, either Idolatry is no part of ungodlineſs, or the Popiſh Religion hath a manifeſt tendency to ungodlineſs.

Inſtance 2. The Popiſh Religion *threw d ſgrace upon the holy Scriptures of God*, whereof I gave an account in many particulars, *Cap.* 3. *Sect.* 1. conſequently it muſt be an unholy Religion; for God hath magnified his Word above all his Name, *Pſa.* 138. 2.

Inſtance 3. Popery opens a Sluice to, and cheriſhes *ungodlineſs*, by many of her Doctrines: As firſt, by *Papal Diſpenſations*, Popes have diſpenſed with Poligamy, Inceſt, Sodomy, whereof D. *Beard* giveth inſtances *retract. Mat. v.* 1. It ſhall ſatisfie me to give you the judgment of the Popes Caſuiſt, *Navarr. Enchirid. cap.* 22. *Sect.* 84. *Edit. Wirceburg.* 1593. The Pope (ſaith he) can diſpence with all prohibited degrees of Conſanguinity and Affinity, excepting only with the Conſanguinity *inter aſcendentes & deſcendentes*, as betwixt the Father and his Daughter, and betwixt the Mother and her Son. And for Fornication, the ſentence of the Canon Law is famous, *Diſt.* 34. *Cap.* 4. He that hath not a Wife, but inſtead of a Wife a Concubine, let him not be kept from the Communion. They have diſpenſed alſo with Perjury, diſobedience to Magiſtrates, and Rebellion againſt lawful Princes; theſe Diſpenſations of Popes, *Bernard* in his time juſtly called *Diſſipations.* Secondly, by *Papal Indulgences*: As Popes can diſpenſe with ſins before they be committed, ſo they can pardon them after they are committed. Who hath not heard of the *Taxa penitentiaria Apoſtolica*; whereby ſins are ſet to ſale, and pardon granted for a little Money? Yea, in it prices are ſet down for his Abſolution who hath killed his Father, Mother, Brother, or Wife, or that hath lain with his Mother, or Siſter. They who cannot have the Book it ſelf, may find a conſiderable account hereof in *Henry Foulis* his Preface to the Hiſtory of *Romiſh Treaſons*; where alſo he ſhews, how debonnaire and frank Popes have been in giving Pardons for hundreds and thouſands of years; and which is more, for ever and ever. Hence one of their own Monks could ſing;

Si

Si dederis Mercat, & iis impleveris Areas
Culpa ſolveris, quaque ligatus eris.
If thou with Marks, will fill their Arks,
What e're thou doſt commit,
By word or deed, thou ſhalt be freed,
The Pope hath pardoned it.

Is it not the cuſtom of Popes to ſend abroad an infinite number of Conſecrated Crucifixes, Medals, *agnus Dei*'s, Holy Grains, Beads, and ſuch like Traſh, that whoſoever wears any of them, if he be at the point of death, and ſay but in his heart the Name of Jeſus, he ſhall have a plenary and full remiſſion of all his ſins? Beſides the great Mart for Indulgences at *Rome*, have they not Prieſts and Jeſuits, like ſo many traffieking Pedlers venting theſe unlucky wares in all places? Do they not hereby open a door to all licentiouſneſs? Who would fear to commit ſin, when Pardon may be obtained at ſo low a rate? Thirdly, by *impoſing upon infinite numbers of perſons in Orders, and in Votaries, the neceſſity of living in Celibate, whether they have a gift of Continency, or not*; yea, by teaching them openly, that it's better to fornicate than marry. So Bell. *lib.* 2 *de Monach. cap.* 30. *Sect. ſed adferamus*; and the *Rhemiſts* on 1 *Cor.* 7. *&c.* How this hath filled the world with filthineſs, I hinted a little before from their own Authors, inſomuch that *Caſſander* profeſſed, *Conſult. Art.* 23. that not one of a hundred of their Monks, Prieſts, or Nuns, lived chaſte. Fourthly, by the *Doctrine of Venial Sins*, teaching people to have low thoughts of ſin, as if there were ſome ſins which of their own nature did not deſerve Hell fire; what will make people bolder on ſin than this? Fifthly, by their *Implicit Faith*, and by prohibiting the multitude to read the Scriptures, they do nouriſh Ignorance, which is both a ſin it ſelf, and the cauſe of more ſin. And ſixthly, not to add more, have not the Popiſh Caſuiſts, eſpecially Jeſuits, by their *Doctrine of Probables, and regulating of their intentions*, taught a way how to commit Villanies without ſin, at leaſt a Mortal ſin; if this be not to open a Gap to impiety, thoſe who have any ſenſe of the true fear of God may judge.

Inſtance 4. Popery contradicts the *Great Deſign of the Goſpel*, which is to ſet forth Jeſus Chriſt as our compleat Saviour. For firſt, it teaches that *Chriſt has not ſatisfied for all our ſins*, but that

we our ſelves muſt ſatisfie, either here, or in Purgatory, not only for the puniſhment due to theſe ſins which they call Venial, but alſo for the temporal puniſhment due to Mortal ſins; yea *Ruardus Tapperus*, as *Bell.* teſtifies *lib.* 4. *de pœnit. cap.* 1. adds, *that we may make ſatisfaction to God for the ſin it ſelf, and the eternal puniſhment due thereto.* Secondly, Popery teaches, if we may believe the *Rhemiſts Annot. in* 2 Tim. 4. 8. *that good works are truly and properly meritorious, and fully worthy of eternal life; and that thereupon Heaven is the due, and juſt ſtipend, Crown, or recompence, which God by his Juſtice oweth to the perſons ſo working*; inſomuch that they ſpare not to ſay, *Annot. in Heb.* 6. 10. *that God would be unjuſt if he rendred not Heaven for the ſame.* To the like purpoſe they ſpeak *Annot. in* 1 *Cor.* 3. 8. Are not theſe impious Doctrines highly injurious to our Bleſſed Redeemer? For if he hath ſatisfied fully for all our ſins, and merited Heaven fully for us, there is no place left for our Merits, or ſatisfaction. And to ſet up humane merits and ſatisfactions, is to accuſe the ſatisfaction and Merits of Chriſt of imperfection. It's but a ridiculous and impious evaſion of Papiſts, that they derogate nothing from Chriſt by their ſatisfactions and merits, becauſe Chriſt purchaſed to them Grace to ſatisfie, and Merit. For beſides, that this is a meer figment, and precarious Aſſertion, without a ſhadow of ground from Scripture, it carries a repugnancy in its own boſom; for if humane ſatisfactions flow from Grace purchaſed by Chriſt, they are not proper ſatisfactions, ſeeing theſe muſt be *ex propriis, & indebitis*, of that which is our own, and not due to him to whom the ſatisfaction is made; beſides ſatisfactions muſt be *ad æqualitatem*, equal to to the injury done: Now can any thing done by us be equal to the offence of the infinite Majeſty of God? Hence *Bell. Lib.* 4. *de pœnit. cap.* 7. wreſtles with his own Conſcience, and ſpeaks manifeſt contradictions as to that thing; as *Dalleus* demonſtrates, *Lib.* 3. *de ſatisfac. & pœnit. cap.* 3. *We ſatisfie*, ſaith he, *and ſatisfie not; our works are equal to the injury, and not equal; they are our own, and not our own.* Thirdly, Popery teaches that *we are not juſtified by the imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt, but by inherent righteouſneſs.* Let any judge if we do not aſcribe more honour to Jeſus, who acknowledge the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to be the ſole ground of our Juſtification, or they who make it a righteouſneſs inherent in us; by *Bellarmin's tutiſſimum*, *Lib.* 5.

Lib. 5. *de Juſtif. cap.* 7. *Tutiſſimum in ſola miſericordia Dei conquieſcere*, it's ſafeſt to repoſe our ſole confidence in the Mercy of God. Fourthly, Popery, at leaſt in the Jeſuit ſenſe, *ſuſpends the efficacy of converting Grace from the Free-will of man*, which may make leſs Grace efficacious, when ſtronger proves inefficacious. So expreſly *Molina*, and other Jeſuits, which gives man occaſion to glory, as if he had made himſelf to differ from another. This vanity is not only redargued by *Auſtin*, *de bono perſever. cap.* 6. but alſo by their own *Caſſander*, *Conſult. de Lib. Arb.* This, ſaith he, *is the part of a godly-minded man, to attribute nothing to himſelf, but all to Gods Grace, &c.* There be many other Popiſh Doctrines injurious to our Redeemer, as that of Supererogation, Interceſſion of Saints in the ſtrength of their Merits, *&c.*

Inſtance 5. Popery, eſpecially Jeſuitiſm, openly teaches, and *juſtifies many impious practices deſtructive to humane nature.* I hint only at three of them; *viz.* 1. *Equivocation.* 2. *Perfidiouſneſs*; and 3. *Rebellion againſt Princes.* I ſay firſt *Equivocation*, Tolet *Inſtruct. Sacerd. lib.* 4. *cap.* 21. *Num.* 5, 6. ſaith, *that a man may not only affirm, but alſo ſwear a known untruth, provided he have but the wit to have a ſecret Mental Reſervation, to compound a true Propoſition of what is ſpoken, and what he thinks: As for example, an Adultereſs may without ſin, not only affirm to her Husband, but alſo ſwear ſhe never knew her Paramour, with this ſecret reſervation, to make it known to her Husband.* The ſame is taught by many more of their approved Authors, *Zanches*, *Parſons*, *Leſſius*, *Valentia*, *Becan*, the Jeſuit with the long name *Andreas Endemon Joannes*, *&c.* when *Garnet*, the Provincial of the Jeſuits, was convicted by the Judges of manifold prevarications upon Oath, he juſtified what he had done, becauſe he had made uſe of his Mental Reſervations; of which ſee *Hoſpin. lib.* 3. *Hiſt. Jeſuit. cap.* 4. *fol.* 168, 169. What converſe can be with men of ſuch a Principle? Though this Doctrine of Equivocations be not yet formed into a Decree; yet when it is ſo publickly and frequently taught by the moſt famed Doctors of the Romiſh Communion, and no cenſure put upon it, whether it may not be charged on the Church, thoſe that are unbyaſſed may judge. Secondly *Perfidiouſneſs*, *eſpecially in their dealings with thoſe they hold for Hereticks.* *John Huſs*, whom they Martyred at the Council of *Conſtance*, contrary to a promiſe of ſafe Conduct given by the Emperour *Sigiſmund*, had experience

perience hereof. Hence *Sinauca Instit. Cathol. Tit.* 56. *Num.* 52. as cited by *Crakanthorp Defens. Eccles. Anglic. Cap.* 83. §. 5. not only asserts *ad penam Hæreticorum pertinere, quod fides illis data servanda non sit*, but also confirms it by the Authority of the Council of *Constance*, and by *Aquinas*, *Crakanthorp*, *ibid.* reports from *Cochleus Lib.* 5. *Hist. Hussit.* of a Letter of Pope *Martin* the Fifth to *Alexander*, Duke of *Lituania*, wherein the Pope thus writes; *Scito te dare fidem Hæreticis non potuisse, & peccare te mortaliter, si servabis*; that is, know that Faith cannot be given to Hereticks, and that it's a mortal sin to keep it. And *Urban* the Sixth proclaimed as much in a publick Bull, which *Crakanthorp cap. cit. Sect.* 6. transcribes, from an Authentick Manuscript thereof, out of Sir *Robert Cotton*'s *Bibliotheca*; perhaps it's on this account, that some Romanists say, they do not maintain that Faith is not to be kept to Hereticks, because, according to them, Faith cannot be given to them I added thirdly, *that Popery teaches Rebellion against Princes.* I shall not blot Paper here with the Positions of private Doctors, as Bell. *lib.* 5. *de Pontif. cap.* 7. *Non licet Christianis tolerare, it is not lawful for Christians to tolerate a King that is an Infidel, or an Heretick, if he endeavour to draw his Subjects to Heresie, or Infidelity*; or that of *Tolet. Instruct. Sacerd. lib.* 1. *cap.* 13. *as long as the Prince continueth Excommunicate, the Subjects are freed from the Oath of Subjection.* But to leave particular Authors; did not *Greg.* the Seventh stir up *Rudolph* of *Suevia* to rebel against *Henry* the Fourth the Emperour? Did not *Paul* the Third Excommunicate *Henry* the Eighth of *England*, and command his Subjects to take Arms against him? Did not *Pius* the Fifth excommunicate Queen *Elizabeth*, and absolve her Subjects from their Allegiance? Pope *Paul* the Fifth did no less to the State of *Venice*, by the Fulminations of his Interdict, pronouncing all excommunicate who should obey them. The Commonwealth of *Lucca* suffered the like from *Urban* the Eighth, as also *Odoardo Farnese* Duke of *Parma.* Whereupon the Author of the Hist. of Card. *Part.* 1. *Lib.* 1. *Pag.* 18. affirms that *Nero*, *Heliogabulus*, *Tarquin*, *Caligula*, and *Dionysius*, arrived never at that height of Tyranny, which the Popes of *Rome* have come to, in dividing Princes and their Subjects. If it be asked, whether Popish Councils have owned such Principles; yea, in their first General Council at *Lyons*, *Anno* 1245. under Pope *Innocent* 4. *Frederick* the Second is deprived

ved by Pope and Council of his Empire, and his Subjects absolved from their Allegiance. The *Lateran* Council, *Anno* 1215. under Pope *Innocent* 3. *cap.* 3. decrees, *If a Temporal Lord neglect to purge his Territories of those whom the Church declares Hereticks, he shall be excommunicated by the Metropolitan, and if he do not amend, the Pope may absolve his Subjects from their Allegiance, and expose his Land to be seized upon by Catholicks.* And the Council of *Constance Sess.* 45. *ordains all Hereticks of whatsoever Dignity, Patriarchal, Archiepiscopal, Regal, Reginal, to be interdicted and deprived.* When *Sixtus* the Fifth thundered out his Bulls against the King of *Navar*, afterwards called *Henry* the Fourth of *France*, and the Prince of *Conde*, depriving them not only of their Lands and Dignities, but also of the right of succession to the French Crown, absolving Subjects from their obedience; he declares he did this to them according to the Canons: Consequently these rebellious Principles are not only the sentiments of private Doctors, but authorized by the Romish Church. Yet I will not fix this imputation upon all Romanists, for all have not Learned these depths of Satan.

But because I added in the Assumption, that more especially the Popish Religion, as maintained by Jesuits, teaches most impious things against both the Tables of the Law of God; hereof abundant examples may be had from the Provincial Letters of *Montalt*, and the Jesuits Morals, collected by a Doctor of *Sarbon*, and *Pyrotechnica Loyolana cap.* 3. *Sect.* 2. *pag.* 38. *&c.* I only collect from them a few particulars.

As 1. That Jesuits hold *that it's sufficient that men love God once before they die; that we are not so much commanded to love God, as not to hate him; yea, that a man may be saved without ever loving God*: That this is taught by Jesuits, especially by *Sirmondus*, is shewed *Provinc. Epist.* 10. and *in notis Wendroke ad Epist.* 10. and by the Author of the *Jesuits Morals*, *Lib.* 2. *Part.* 2. *Cap.* 2. *Art.* 1.

Secondly, that *a man may be saved without Contrition; that attrition or sorrow for sin out of fear of Hell, though only general without reflexion on particular sins, though slender without intention of degrees, and though of short continuance, but for one instant, yet if joyned with Sacerdotal Absolution, may be sufficient for the pardon of sin.* And this *Escobar* holds out, not only as one of their probable Doctrines, but as a certain truth, *Tom.* 2. *Theol. Moral. lib.* 14.

de Sacr. panit. Sect. 1. *cap.* 5. and confirms it from the Council of *Trent*, *Sess.* 14. *cap.* 6, 7. yea *Montalt Epist.* 10. shews from *Greg. de Valentia*, that they hold Contrition to be hurtful to the Sacrament of Penance; for Contrition blotting out sin of it self, leaves nothing to be done by the Sacrament of Penance. *Escobar* affirms as much on the matter *lib.* 14. *de Sacram. panit. Sect.* 2. *Probl.* 26. *Num.* 125. of the impious Doctrines of Jesuits concerning repentance; see the Author of the Jesuits Morals discoursing at length, *lib.* 2. *Part.* 1. *Cap.* 2. *Art.* 1.

Thirdly, that *Jesuits allow horrid Idolatry, yea and witchcraft*; particularly that they allowed their proselited Christians in *China*, and the *Indies*, to joyn in Heathenish Idolatry, by this subtil evasion of hiding under their Cloaths an Image of Christ, to which they might by a Mental Reservation direct these publick Adorations which they gave to the Heathenish Idols, *Cachim*, *Choan*, and *Keum Fucum*. This *Montalt* proves to be done by them *Epist.* 5. and *that it's lawful to use Charms, to consult Conjurers, that the diligence of an expert Conjurer in Diabolical Arts is worthy of a reward.* This the Author of the Jesuits Morals *lib.* 2. *Part.* 2. *cap.* 2. *Art.* 1. *Point.* 4. *pag.* 289. proves from *Tambourin*, *Zanchez*, and *Sanctius*, and *Montalt Epist. Provinc.* 8.

Fourthly, Jesuits *excuse and extenuate the sins of swearing, blaspheming*, as is shewed copiously in the Jesuits Morals, *pag.* 291. To swear lightly and unconcernedly, is only a venial sin, saith *Zanchez*; yea, the Author of *Pyrotech. Loyol. pag.* 40. says, *they hold it to be a less sin than to eat an Egg in* Lent; *that to call God to be witness to a little lye, doth not deserve damnation*; *that by the* Bulla Cruciata *a man may be dispensed with the Vow he hath made not to commit Fornication, or any other sin.*

Fifthly, Jesuits have so little regard to the Spiritual Worship of God, *that they affirm that it's enough that a man be bodily present at Religious Service, though he be absent as to his mind, providing he behave himself with external reverence*, This *Montalt Epist. Provinc.* 9. proves from *Gaspar Hurtadus*, *Conink*; yea brings in *Vasquez* and *Escobar* granting, that a man may satisfie the Command concerning the Worship of God, though he come with positive intentions not to attend the Worship of God, *sed libidinose aspiciendi feminas.*

Sixthly, *Jesuits destroy the duty which Children owe to Parents.* *Tambourin* and *Castro-Palao*, cited by the Author of the Jesuits Morals,

Morals, *pag.* 298. affirm, that *a Child may deſign the death of a Parent, that he may ſucceed to the Inheritance; and Inferiours may long for the death of Superiours, to obtain their places, and they can allow Children to marry without the conſent of Parents.* I will here tranſcribe from the Jeſuits Morals, *pag.* 300. the words of Jeſuit *Tambourin*, as to this caſe, how he goes over the Belly of Scripture, Fathers, and Popes; though, ſaith *Tambourin*, Pope *Euariſtus* have ordained that a Daughter ſhould not be held for a married Wife, if her Father agreed not to the Marriage; though Pope S. *Leo* and S. *Ambroſe* ſay, that it's not becoming the modeſty of a Virgin to chuſe an Husband, but that ſhe ought to attend on her Fathers judgment. Though in the holy Scripture this charge be laid upon Fathers, that Daughters be given in Marriage by them, though many examples of Saints do ſhew this manifeſtly, yet I anſwer (ſaith he) with *Sanchez*, *that theſe, and ſuch like, prove well, that it's very commendable for them to demand their Fathers advice, but not that they in not doing ſo, fall into the horrible diſorder of mortal ſin.* Thus Jeſuits inſolently elude Scriptures, and Fathers, to countenance diſobedience and impudence in children, and to favour Rapes and Clandeſtine Marriages.

Seventhly, *Jeſuits, contrary to the ſixth Command, authorize moſt bloody murthers*; as that a man who could eſcape by flying, may kill another, who intends to aſſault him for his life. So *Leſſius de Juſt. & Jur. lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. *dub.* 8. *Num.* 44, 45. yea, *that he may kill for a box in the ear, for reproachful words, or geſtures, albeit the Crimes objected be true*: So *Leſſius ibid. dub.* 12. *num.* 7. 8. 81. *or for the defence of his goods, were it but for an Apple, or a Crown, if this ſhould occaſion reproach or diſgrace.* That this is the Doctrine of *Amicus*, and other Jeſuits, is ſhewed by the Author of the Jeſuits Morals, *pag.* 312. *&c.*

Eighthly, *Contrary to the ſeventh Command; they teach, that though a woman were ſenſible what an ill effect her vain and gorgeous Dreſſes would work on the Bodies and Souls of thoſe that ſhould ſee her, yet were it no ſin at all to make uſe thereof*; as *Montalt Epiſt.* 9. ſhews from *Eſcobar*, and *Bauny*; and the Author of the Jeſuits Morals, *pag.* 334. brings in *Tambourin*, *Azorius*, and *Fagundez* aſſerting, *that there may be invincible ignorance in ſome, of the Precept, which forbids Fornication*; and conſequently, according to theſe Authors, it may be practiſed by ſuch innocently, and without

ſin. And *pag.* 337, 338. he cites *Leſſius*, *Tolet*, *Sanchez*, and *Eſtebar* affirming, *that pollution for health, and other ends, may be deſired and rejoyced in.* I bluſh to relate the filthy caſes, and impious deciſions of that Jeſuited Caſuiſt *Diana reſolut. Moral. Part.* 2. *tract.* 17. *reſolut.* 37, 38.

Ninthly, *Contrary to the eighth Command, Jeſuits teach and approve theftuous practices*, *Emmanuel Sa. verbo furtum*, *pag.* 262. teaches, *that it is lawful to ſteal from a rich man, who is bound in conſcience to ſupply the neceſſities of the poor.* *Baunius*, as cited in the Jeſuits Morals, *pag.* 341. affirms, *that a man is not bound to reſtore what is taken by many petty thefts, whatever the total ſum thereof may amount to.* The Author of *Pyrotechnica Loyolana*, *pag.* 44. ſhews from the myſtery of Jeſuitiſm, that they hold *a Son may ſteal from the Father, that Servants may rob their Maſters to make their wages proportionable to their ſervice, that a Religious man may quit his habit to go and ſteal, as well as go* incognito *to the Stews, that Cheating is lawful under the notion of their contract Mohatra*; yea *Baunius*, as cited in the Jeſuits Morals, *pag.* 343. ſaith, *that a Wife or Children being called into Judgment, to ſee themſelves ordained to confeſs what they have put aſide, taken, or uſurped of the moveables, inheritance, or goods of the deceaſed, are not in Conſcience to confeſs it; and becauſe they may be brought upon their Oaths, and obliged to ſwear before a Judge*, he gives them this expedient, *Nevertheleſs that they may not lye, and ſo doing forſwear themſelves, the prudent Confeſſor ſhall teach them, that they are to frame a conception in their minds, according to which they may form the Anſwer and Oath, which they may make by the Command of the Judge, to juſtifie and make him believe their Innocence.* Is not this to add perjury to theft? Of the theftuous practiſes of Jeſuits, according to theſe their principles, a large account is given in a Tractate, entituled, *The Moral practiſe of Jeſuits*: Nay, they teach how to make Simoniacal tranſactions without ſin, by ordering of the intentions, as is ſhewed in *Pyrotechnica Loyolana*, *pag.* 44.

I only add tenthly, that Jeſuits teach *groſs violations of the ninth Command*, not only by their equivocations, and mental reſervations, at which I hinted before, but alſo by ſaying, that it is allowable to defame an Adverſary, by charging him with crimes whereof he is not guilty, as is ſhewed by *Montalt Epiſt.* 15. Theſe Principles of Lying being inſtilled by Jeſuits into the Empereſſes Ladies, the whole Court was put into a com-

buſtion

buſtion by falſe reports, until *Quivoga* the Capucin convinced the Empreſs of theſe pernicious lying Principles of Jeſuits. Time would fail me in reckoning forth the impious Doctrines of Jeſuits; theſe few hints, I hope, may ſuffice to demonſtrate, that the Doctrines of Popery, and more eſpecially as maintained by Jeſuits, have a Native tendency to impiety. Well did the Apoſtle 2 *Theſ.* 2. term it *a Myſtery of Iniquity.*

The Phariſaical Cob-webs of pretended Piety wherewith this Pamphleter from *pag.* 199. would commend their Religion, are eaſily ſwept away.

As 1. He talks *of the glorious Temples and Hoſpitals*, &c. *which they have built.* Have not Heathens and Mahumetans done the like? How glorious was the Temple of *Diana* at *Epheſus?* How ſtately are the *Moſche*'s of Mahumetans at *Conſtantinople?* Did not *Herod* build the Temple of *Jeruſalem* with ſuch magnificence, that ſome think it did exceed the glory of *Solomon*'s Temple? Did not Phariſees build the Monuments of the Prophets? Is it not ſaid of Apoſtate Iſrael, *Hoſ.* 8. 14. he hath forgotten his Maker, and buildeth Temples? Doth he not remember, that the ſame Objection was made of old both by Heathens againſt Chriſtians, and by Arrians againſt the Orthodox? In a word, therefore we do allow comely Edifices for the Worſhip of God, and endowments for pious uſes. It's the obſervation of that Learned and Ingenuous Perſon Doctor *Don Serm.* on *Matth.* 5. 16. that there have been more endowments for pious uſes in this laſt Century ſince the Reformation in *England*, than was in any one Century when Popery prevailed; only this I muſt add, it's not curious Fabricks, but pure Doctrine, and ſpiritual worſhip, which do demonſtrate a true Church; but Popiſh Temples are full of Idols, Superſtition, and Idolatry.

He obiects ſecondly, *they have thouſands of Monks who have renounced the world, and live chaſtly, and contemn riches and pleaſures*; and ſo have Mahumetans their Votaries, and Recluſes. I believe it will trouble Romaniſts to give a Scripture Warrant, or Preſident, from the firſt times of the Goſpel Church, for thoſe who could be uſeful to the Church, to ſhut themſelves up in Cells from all converſe with men. Who knows not how unlike the Monaſtick life at this preſent in the Romiſh Church, is from that which at length crept into the Church in ancient

times; yet we ſhould not ſo much blame them who betake themſelves to Monaſtick retirements, if they gave themſelves to the ſerious ſtudy of Mortification, and to the true exerciſe of Religious Duties preſcribed in the holy Scriptures. But the devotion of Romiſh Monks is for moſt part meer Superſtition, conſiſting in the obſervation of ſome Rules invented by ſuperſtitious perſons, as *Francis*, *Dominick*, *&c.* What impiety is acted under a pretence of Monaſtick auſterity, I hinted before. Now let any conſider what great Mortification it is, under a pretence of Poverty, to go into ſtately Palaces endued with rich Revenues? under a pretence of Faſting, to feed on ſuch chear, as a Senſual Epicure would prefer before ſumptuous Feaſts? under a pretence of Chaſtity, to Vow againſt Marriage, which is Gods Ordinance, but not againſt other fleſhly impurities? Hence *Bell.* gives this reaſon why it's leſs ſin for a Prieſt to Fornicate than Marry, becauſe by Marrying he violates the Vow of Continency, implying they vow not againſt Concubines. Laſtly, many who retire to Monaſteries, do it either on a *tedium* of worldly buſineſs, or diſcontent, or ſuperſtitiouſly, to expiate ſome atrocious crime, *deſperatio facit Monachum.*

But thirdly, ſays he, *they have Saints, as* Gregori's, *and* Leo's, *and* Cæleſtin's. *&c.* But who gave their Pope power of Canonizing Saints? Is not this an Innovation unknown to Antiquity? How can the Pope infallibly know the Sanctity of others, when he cannot be ſure of his own? Nay, have not many of them lived like incarnate Devils? Have they not Canonized ſome for Money? others to promote ſuperſtitious ends, yea ſome who never were? Do not their own Authors, ſuch as Cardinal *Cajetan*, queſtion the Popes Infallibility in Canonizing, *&c.* I ſuppoſe he will not ſay all their Pope *Leo*'s and *Gregori*'s were Saints. I believe not *Greg.* the Second, who pronounced *Hezekiah* an Heretick for breaking of the Brazen Serpent; nor *Greg.* 9. who tyrannized over *Frederick* the Second. Who may not paſs for a Saint among them, ſeeing *Greg.* 7. that Brand of Hell, has a [illegible] in their Calendar, why have they not added *Leo* the Tenth, who looked on the Goſpel as a Fable, to bear him company? As for *Cæleſtin's*; was that Sanctity or Simplicity in *Celeſtine* the Fifth, to be cheated by *Boniface* the Eighth out of the Popedom to an Hermitage? But *Boniface*

fearing

fearing he might revoke that Sanctity, ſhut him up in Priſon, where he died for diſpleaſure that he had been fooled out of the Papacy.

But fourthly, *He pitches on ſome real Saints, as* Chryſoſtom, Ambroſe, Auſtin, *and* 36 *ancient Biſhops of* Rome *that were Martyrs.* I grant theſe were Saints, but none of them Papiſts, more than the Prophets were Phariſees, though the Phariſees built their Tombs. Yea, nor was *Bernard*, though he lived in late and corrupt times, a Romaniſt of the late Edition; he did not approve the whole Syſteme of the now *Tridentine* Faith, though he eſcaped not altogether the Contagion of the times he lived in; he was indeed a Monk, and in many things ſuperſtitious, yet not a through-paced Papiſt, as is ſhewed by D. *Francis White* in defence of his Brother D. *John White* againſt *T. W. P. Pap.* 313, 314. and in particular, that he held the ſufficiency of the Scriptures without Traditions, Juſtification by Faith alone, that our works do not merit of condignity, that no man is able to keep the Law perfectly, that a juſt man may through mercy be aſſured of Grace, that there is no ſuch Free-will in fallen man as Jeſuits aſſert, and that he ſtood againſt the pride of the Pope, and the Immaculate Conception of the *Virgin Mary.* To theſe, which D. *John White* had confirmed from *Bernards* writings, D. *Francis* adds divers other points, as that he held the Euchariſt is to be a Commemorative Sacrifice, that he taught not Adoration of Images, that he believed Habitual Concupiſcence to be a ſin, and that he maintained the Authority and Preheminence of the Civil Magiſtrate, and the ſubjection of the Apoſtles, and of all Eccleſiaſticks to his Juriſdiction.

This third and laſt Note of the Church, taken from Sanctity, might be inverted as the former hath been, not only from the Identity of our Religion with the Apoſtolick Religion, which is the only truly holy Religion, but alſo by appealing our Adverſaries, to pitch upon one Article agreed on in the Harmony of Confeſſions, which hath not a tendency to Holineſs. And laſtly, by putting all to it, who have but ſo much indifferency as to be ingenuous, if the Reformed Churches have not always afforded multitude of ſerious, unblameable and devout perſons.

By this time, I hope, it may appear, that the Pamphleters three

three Notes of the Church, Miracles, Converſion of Infidels, and Sanctity of Life, make nothing for the Catholiciſm of the Romiſh Church, but prove convincingly the truth of the Reformed Church. Had he brought the reſt of *Bellarmin*'s Notes, he ſhould have found them to be as little for his advantage.

SECT. IV.

A touch of the Pamphletrs hints at two other Notes of their Church, viz. the Title of Catholick, and Succeſſion.

HE ſnarles paſſingly *pag.* 201, 202. *at the Name of Catholick*, as if the Argument held from names to things: Do not falſe Prophets, falſe Apoſtles, and falſe gods, aſſume the names of true Prophets, Apoſtles, and of the true God? Was not *Simon Magus Act.* 8. 10. called the Power of God? Did not *Mahomet* call himſelf the Great Prophet, and his Diſciples *Muſſelmans*, that is, ſound believers, and *Abdullam*, or the ſervants of God? Hath not the Title of Catholick been aſſumed by *Novatians*, as witneſſeth *Cyprian Epiſt.* 73. by *Donatiſts*, as teſtifies *Auſtin in Brevic. collat. col.* 3. *dici cap.* 2. yea by all Hereticks, if we believe *Lactant. Inſtit. lib.* 4. *cap.* 30. and *Auſtin contra Epiſt. Fundamenti cap.* 4. The Orthodox alſo are ready ſometimes to indulge Hereticks with the ſplendid names which they vainly aſſume to themſelves, as ſome were called *Apoſtolici*, ſome *Angelici*, others *Gnoſtici*, *&c.* beſides it's queſtioned, whether the Chriſtian Church was always adorned with the Title of Catholick; the contrary ſeems to be yielded by *Pacianus Epiſt.* 1. *ad Sempron.* and D. *Pearſon* on the Creed, *Art.* 9. brings great Authorities to prove, that in ancient Editions of the Apoſtolick Creed, eſpecially in the Roman and Weſtern Church, this Epithete *Catholick* was not added to the Church. However, ſure I am, the Title of *Catholick*, without the true Catholick Faith, is but *magni nominis umbra*. Certainly the Roman Church is not the Catholick, if either the Catholick Church be taken for the Orthodox Church, in which ſenſe the Fathers termed particular Churches Catholick, as that of *Smyrna* in *Euſeb. Hiſt. lib.* 4. *cap.* 15. that of *Nazianzum*, and many others, in *Greg. Nazianzens* latter will. But the Roman being groſly Heterodox, as hath been proved, is not Catholick

lick in this sense; nor is she Catholick, if the Catholick and Universal be the same, the Roman being but a part, and lesser part of Christendom, the greater and sounder part, at this day, renouncing Communion with her; yea, Papists call themselves *Catholicks* with a term diminuent, *Catholick Romans*; *i. e.* Catholicks, not Catholicks, or Schismatical Catholicks, who being but a part of the Catholick Church, would Monopolize Catholicism to themselves alone. When therefore Protestants call Romanists Catholicks, they do as when they call the Turks *Musselmans*, because they assume these Titles, though undeservedly, to themselves. That of *Pacianus* in the forecited Epistle is very remarkable; *Novatianos audio de Novato, aut Novatiano vocari, Sectam tamen in his, non nomen incuso: Nec Montano aliquis aut Phrygibus nomen objecit.*

As insignificant is his other hint, *pag.* 202. *at the pretended perpetual Succession of Pastors in the Roman Church from the Apostles.* For Succession meerly personal, and local, if it be not also Doctrinal, cannot prove a true Church. Hence *Iren. lib.* 4. *cap.* 43. joyns, *Cum Episcopatus Successione charisma veritatis*; *i. e.* the gift of Truth with succession; and *Epiphan. Hæres.* 55. teaches, that now we are chiefly to enquire after *successiones Doctrinæ*, *i.e.* the succession of Doctrine; and *Tertull. de Præscript. contra Hæret. cap.* 32. saith, *Though Hereticks should pretend a Succession of Bishops, yet the diversity of their Doctrine from the Doctrine of Apostles, will prove them not to be of Apostolical descent.* And again, albeit some Churches could instance no Apostles, or Apostolick persons from whom they are descended, *tamen in eadem fide conspirantes*, yet being found to have the same Faith, *Apostolicæ deputantur pro consanguinitate Doctrinæ*, they are accounted Apostolick, because of the consanguinity of Doctrine. Excellently said *Nazlanzen Orat.* 21. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὁμογνώμων καὶ ὁμοθρονὸν τὸ δὲ ἀντὶ δοξὸν καὶ ἀντιθρονὸν, καὶ ἡμῖν προσηγορίαν, ἢ δὲ ἀλεθείαν ἔχει διαδοχῆς; i. e. *He who professed the same Doctrine of Faith, hath an interest in the same Throne or See; but he that defends contrary Doctrine, is Adversary to the See; for this latter hath but the name of Succession, but the other the truth and reality thereof.* What need I more, seeing their own Learned *Stapleton, Controv.* 1. *q.*4. *art.*2. *Notab.* 5. confesseth, that bare personal and local Succession is not a sure Note of the true and Orthodox Church. And surely we cannot conclude from it the being of the Church, either

either affirmatively, or negatively; not affirmatively, by *Bell.* his confeſſion, *lib.* 4. *de Eccleſ. cap.* 8. for when Arrianiſm overſpread the Oriental Churches, they had a perſonal and local ſucceſſion of Biſhops; nor yet negatively, as if they were no Churches, where perſonal ſucceſſion is wanting, elſe the firſt Apoſtolick Church which ſucceeded to none, had been no true Church; yea, there ſhould hardly be a Church to day upon the Face of the Earth, there hardly being a Church founded by the Apoſtles, in which, alas for pity! the Lyn of Succeſſion hath not ſome time or other been perturbed with the intervention of Hereſie, the Roman not excepted. *Greg. de Valentia Tom.* 3. *Diſp.* 1. *q.* 1. *punct.* 6. acknowledges ſome Doctrines of Faith, either thorough negligence, errour, or wickedneſs of men, may for a time be as buried, which afterward thorough the Churches diligence may be revived.

But as for the Roman Church, ſhe hath neither Doctrinal nor Perſonal Succeſſion; not Doctrinal, as I have proved *cap.* 7. yea it will be hard to prove, that the Complex of their preſent Religion is elder than the Council of *Trent.* Nor Perſonal: Is it not evident from Hiſtory, that ſome have taken the Papal Chair by Force, ſome by Fraud, ſome by Simony, ſome by Magical Arts, yea and ſome of them have been openly Heretical, as Romaniſts themſelves reckon Hereſie, if *Arrians*, *Neſtorians*, *Montaniſts*, *Eutychians*, *Monothelites* be Hereticks. Hereof we gave a touch *Cap.* 2. *Sect.* 2. *Arg.* 3. Sure I am the reſt of the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Jeruſalem*, can inſtruct a perſonal Succeſſion no leſs than *Rome.* Excellently did one compare the Pope of *Rome* pretending to ſucceed *Peter*, becauſe he ſits in the Roman Chair, unto *Vibius Ruffus*, of whom *Xiphilinus* in the Life of *Dion* reports, that becauſe he ſat in *Julius Cæſar*'s Chair, therefore he gloried as if he had been *Cæſar.*

The chief Cavils moved by Romaniſts againſt our Succeſſion, relate to the Call and Miſſion of our Reformers, and ſucceeding Paſtors, which though this Pamphleter hath not touched, yet ſeeing others lay ſo much ſtreſs upon them, and they may appear ſomewhat ſpecious to leſs diſcerning perſons, I judged it might not be unfit briefly to reſolve the more important of them.

Firſt then they object this, *The Call and Miſſion of our firſt Reformers*

formers was neither extraordinary, and immediate, nor ordinary and mediate, and conſequently null; not extraordinary and immediate, elſe it had been confirmed by Miracles, and extraordinary Credentials, nor mediate and ordinary, there being none by whom they could have a mediate Miſſion, but by the Miniſters of the Church of Rome, *whom the moſt of Proteſtants hold to be Antichriſtian; But the Miniſters of the true Church of Chriſt cannot receive their Miſſion from the Miniſters of Antichriſt; ſuppoſing by this Argument the nullity of the Call of our Reformers to be evicted, the nullity of ſucceeding Paſtors is alſo concluded, as deriving their Miſſion from the firſt Reformers, and ſo a* non habentibus poteſtatem. *Yea laſtly, hence the nullity of all Proteſtant Churches is inferred, becauſe as* Jerom contra Lucifer. *pronounces,* Eccleſia non eſt quæ non habet Sacerdotem, *It can be no Church that hath no Miniſtry.* I know no Sophiſm wherein Romaniſts do more triumph, or the not penetrating the fallacy whereof, hath driven weak and leſs conſiderate Proteſtants upon more Precipices. This one Cavil is more ſpecious than all our Pamphleter ſaid: But I ſhall not decline to grapple with them, where their chief ſtrength doth lye.

In diſcovery therefore of the fallacy of this Sophiſm, I ſhall begin at the laſt and chief inference of the nullity of the Church, from the nullity of the Miniſtry, concerning which, I propoſe theſe two diſtinctions. Firſt, where there is no Miniſtry, there is no Organical Church compleatly furniſhed with her Officers, it's granted; no Entitative Church, or no Society profeſſing the Catholick Faith, it's denied: elſe when the Miniſters and Officers of a Church are removed by death, the Church ſhould periſh; but *Act.* 14. 23. it's ſaid, *the Apoſtles ordained Elders in every Church*; κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, where it ſeems to be ſuppoſed they were Churches, for a time, without Paſtors; that is, they were Societies of viſible Profeſſors of the Faith of Jeſus Chriſt. But take this other diſtinction; there is no Catholick Church without a Miniſtry, it's granted: no particular Church, is denied. It's true, *Epheſ.* 4. 11, 12, 13. there is a promiſe of perpetuity of a Miniſtry in the Catholick Church, for the edifying of the body; but it's no where promiſed that particular Churches ſhould never be deprived of their Paſtors for a time. And ſo though theſe Churches, *Act.* 14. for a time wanted Paſtors to take particular inſpection of them, yet even then there were Paſtors in the Catholick

Church, as the Apoſtles, and others; and this is all which either *Jerom* in the place cited, or *Cyprian Epiſt. 69.* in a like teſtimony intended. From which I infer, though it were granted, which yet is ſplendidly falſe, that there were no lawful Paſtors in the Reformed Churches, yet the nullity of theſe Churches could not be concluded, but only a defect of needful Organs and Office-bearers, yea, though there were neither Paſtors in Reformed Churches, nor in the Roman, yet would it not follow, that the Catholick Church had no Paſtors, for the Catholick Church extends it ſelf far beyond them both.

But in the next place I examine their firſt *medium*, and ſo overthrow all; it's a ſplendid falſhood, that the call of our Reformers was null, for it had the Eſſentials requiſite to the call of Paſtors, conſequently ſucceeding Paſtors are ordained, *ab habentibus poteſtatem*; as to that *Dilemma* which hath been ſo often canvaſed and confuted, I anſwer, *the Call of Reformers was mediate and ordinary*, and ſo needed not extraordinary Credentials. They were not called to any new Function, or to preach any new truths; whereas ſome have ſaid their Call was extraordinary. It is to be underſtood only *quoad modum*, *non quoad ſubſtantiam*; or in regard of Heroick, and in ſome ſort, extraordinary endowments wherewith they were fitted for reviving collapſed truths, as is largely expounded by *Voetius, lib. 2. deſper. cauſ. Pap. Stil. 2. cap. 24.* and D. *Pridraux de vocat. Miniſt. §. 7.*

But it's urged, *that then they have had their Miſſion from Miniſters of the Church of* Rome, *whom many Proteſtants hold as Antichriſtian.* It's readily granted, and that without the leaſt advantage to the Romiſh Intereſt, or detriment to the Reformed Religion.

For ſatisfying thoſe that are judicious herein, let theſe few things be conſidered. And firſt, Though all Proteſtants be not agreed that the latter Popes of *Rome* are the grand Antichriſt, yet they who ſpeak moſt mildly in the thing, cannot but acknowledge that Romaniſts hold many Antichriſtian Doctrines, and that the ſpirit of Antichriſt hath long wrought in the chief Rulers of the Church of *Rome*, both in regard of their Heretical Doctrines, eſpecially that of Papal Infallibility, then which not one can better ſerve the turn of Antichriſt, and of the exorbitant power uſurped by Popes, not only over

all

all Biſhops, but alſo over Kings, and whatſoever is called God. See of this D. *Fern* in his conſiderations of the Church of *England* Reformed, *cap.* 4. Secondly, according to the principles of both theſe (not only of them who hold the Pope to be a Petit Antichriſt, and a Fore-runner of the Great One, but alſo of them who affirm him to be the Grand Antichriſt) our Lord under the Papal Tyranny preſerved a Church in theſe Weſtern parts, and conſequently many great truths, ſuch as the Trinity, and Incarnation, and the ſubſtantials of many Ordinances, particularly of Baptiſm, and of Ordination, albeit both of them were clogged with additional corruptions; yet in evidence that the Reformed Churches held their Baptiſm and Ordination valid, they did not rebaptize, or reordain thoſe who had been baptized, or ordained by the Church of *Rome*: Neither need any think ſtrange at this, who remember that it's predicted of the Great Antichriſt, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 4. *that he ſhall ſit in the Temple of God.* From which it follows, that though Popes be the Great Antichriſt, yet Orders being one of theſe remains which God had preſerved under Antichriſts Uſurpation, Ordination conferred by Antichriſtian Miniſters (not in ſo far as Antichriſtian, but as retaining ſome of Chriſts goods) might be valid. Thirdly, I add, that in this the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God doth greatly appear, that under the prevalency of the Tyranny of the Papal Faction, he would preſerve a Church, and thereby tranſmit to Poſterity the Holy Scriptures, which did luculently diſcover the corruptions of that Apoſtatized Church, and convey down orders to Miniſters, who by vertue of their Ordination were authorized and obliged to endeavour the Reformation of the Church. Fourthly, that our Reformers did not ſet up a new Church, but did reform the old Apoſtatized Church; ſo that there needed no new Ordination, or immediate Call, but only faithfully to improve the power given them in their Ordination, to ſhake off, and witneſs againſt the corruptions of that lapſed Church. And fifthly and laſtly, this muſt be added, though Ordination was clogged with corruptions at the time when our Reformers received Ordination in the Church of *Rome*, yet was not Ordination in the Romiſh Church by far ſo corrupt as now it is, for then Pope *Pius* the Fourth, his impious Oath, which he impoſed upon all perſons to be Ordained, was

not contrived. By all this, I hope, it may appear, that our Reformers Ordination was valid, though received by Romiſh Miniſters, and yet the Romiſh Party not vindicated from Antichriſtianiſm.

It's further objected, *that Proteſtants look upon Romaniſts as Hereticks, and conſequently ought to look upon Ordination from them as null.* *Anſw.* That ſequel is null; Do not Romaniſts maintain, that Orders imprint an indeleble character on the Soul, which neither Schiſm nor Hereſie can extinguiſh, and that Sacraments conferred by Hereticks are valid, and particularly of this Sacrament of Orders? Jeſuit *Connick Tom.* 2. *de Sacram. diſp.* 20. *dub.* 9. *Num.* 84. concludes, *Certum omnino eſt Epiſcopum Excommunicatum, Hæreticum, & degradatum, validè conferre ordines*; *i. e.* It is altogether certain, that Orders conferred by a Biſhop Excommunicated, Heretical, and degraded, are valid. And though Proteſtants acknowledge no ſuch Sacramental character impreſſed on the Soul, yet they affirm that by Ordination a power is conferred, which is not utterly made void by every Schiſm or Hereſie; ſo that though Schiſmaticks, or Hereticks, act irregularly in ordaining, yet Orders conferred by them are not null and void: Neither are they whom Schiſmaticks or Hereticks ordain, bound in conſcience to propagate the Schiſm or Hereſies of thoſe who ordained them: yea, by relinquiſhing the Schiſm and Hereſies of their Ordainers, what irregularity was in their Ordination is ſupplied, and they come into a capacity of conferring Orders regularly, which their Ordainers abiding in Schiſm or Hereſie could not do. Hence it apparently follows, that though Romaniſts be both Schiſmatical and Heretical, and act irregularly in conferring Orders, yet the Orders conferred by them to our Reformers, were not only valid, but alſo the Reformers, by relinquiſhing the Heretical Doctrines, and Schiſmatical principles and practices of the Church of *Rome*, and by owning the Catholick Truths oppugned by Romaniſts, had the defects and irregularity of their Ordination ſupplied. Thus Romaniſts themſelves anſwer concerning the Biſhops whom they own, who had been ordained by *Cranmer* in the time of Schiſm, as they call it, ſaying, they attained the regular uſe of their Orders by returning from Schiſm and Hereſie in Queen *Mary*'s time, when they were reconciled to the Church of *Rome*; they ought

not

not then offend at us for making uſe of the ſame Reply to them. I ſhut up this Anſwer to this Objection with that ſaying of S. *Auſtin, Epiſt.* 165. *Et ſi quiſquam traditor ſubrepſiſſet*; albeit ſome Traytor had crept into the Church (he means the Roman, in which too too many Judaſſes have been ſeen ſince that time) *nihil præjudicaret Eccleſiæ, aut Innocentibus Chriſtianis*, it ſhould nothing prejudice the Church, or Innocent Chriſtians.

From *pag.* 203. to 207. *he breaks forth into a Flood of Thraſonick Clamours*, as void of truth, as of ſobriety, as if Proteſtants acknowledged *the Popiſh Church to be the moſt Antient Church, and ever to have poſſeſſed the greateſt part of the Chriſtian World, converting Nations, working Miracles, and that the Church before* Luther *ſhould have been deſtitute of the true Letter and ſenſe of Scripture*; and thereupon vainly miſapplys to the Romiſh Church that word of *Tertull. Olim poſſideo, prior poſſideo.* The falſhood of all theſe hath been already as copiouſly demonſtrated, as the nature of this Tractate would permit: And particularly it hath been ſhewed, that one of our great Exceptions againſt the Popiſh Church is her Novelty, under a Mask of falſly pretended Antiquity. That the Complex of their *Trent* Religion is latter than *Luther*, and that the truly Catholick Church continued in all Ages, having both the Letter and ſenſe of holy Scripture, and Subſtantials of Faith maintaining the ſame Religion, which the Reformed Churches do to this day; conſequently the Reformed Churches are truly a part of that Catholick Church, from which Romaniſts do Schiſmatically ſeparate themſelves. Though Romaniſts had more Antiquity than they have, yet that of *Tertull. lib. de Veland. Virg. Cap.* 1. might ſtop their mouths, *Nec veritati præſcribere poteſt Spatium temporum, vel patrocinia perſonarum, vel privilegia Regionum.* Neither length of time, nor Patrociny of perſons, nor priviledges of Countries, can preſcribe againſt Truth.

SECT.

SECT. V.

A Brief Reparty to his Concluſory Knacks.

THe vain Knacks where with he ſhuts up his Treatiſe, *pag.* 207, 208. are ſolidly confuted to my hand, by Learned and Judicious Mr. *Rait* in his Vindication of the Proteſtant Religion, *pag.* 268. for with the ſame froathy talk his Adverſary alſo had concluded his Scriblings; It ſhall be enough therefore to me to make this Retorſion on Romaniſts.

They have Faith without Verity, Unity of Intereſt without Unity of Judgment, a Catholick Church without Catholiciſm, excluding the greateſt part of Chriſtendom, an Infallible Judge defining contradictions, and make the Divine Law a Noſe of Wax; a Church with many Heads, Altars, and Sacrifices, without Divine Inſtitution, a Propitiatory Sacrifice, without ſhedding of blood, yea, without a ſacrificing act, Image-worſhip, Bread-worſhip, Croſs-worſhip, Relick-worſhip, Saint-worſhip, (if they may be believed) without Idolatry, Sacraments without viſible Elements, Sacraments ſo far from ſanctifying, that their moſt Religious perſons are obliged to vow abſtinence from them, Specters of accidents without a ſubject, they eat and devour their God, they have devotion without underſtanding, performing holy things in an unknown Language; they have Paſtors without Preaching, Communion without Communicants; they maintain a ſinleſs perfection, yet teach manifeſt violations of the Law of God; they cannot only merit Heaven by their works, but alſo ſupererrogate, yet in many things they offend all; the Satisfaction of Chriſt, according to them, needs a ſupply of penal ſatisfactions, either in this life, or in Purgatory; the Efficacy of Grace depends on the beck of Free-will, and Eternal Election muſt be founded on the preſcience of mens good works, Popes have Apoſtolical Function, but no immediate Miſſion, nor ſpeak they with Tongues, *&c.* they obtrude lying ſigns and wonders, yea, ridiculous Fables, for real Miracles, the Enthuſiaſms of their Popes for Divine Oracles, and bundles of Novelties under the Vizour of Antiquity; many Books they hold for Canonical Scripture, which neither the Jewiſh nor Primitive Chriſtian Church

Church did ever own. In a word, they ſet up a Religion built upon no Divine Authority, but upon Humane Traditions, and definitions of their Church, repugnant to Scripture, to Antiquity, to Reaſon, and to the ſenſes of all the world, teaching impious Idolatry againſt God, and perfidiouſneſs to men, receiving addition, or alteration, as the Grandees of the Romiſh Faction find moſt to conduce for the Grandeur of the Pope, and Intereſt of the Court of *Rome*.

But leſt I ſhould ſeem to ſay nothing to his Knacks, I anſwer firſt, we have *both Faith and Unity*, Faith grounded on holy Scripture; and not only Unity in Fundamentals, which is neceſſary to the being of the Church Militant, but alſo in moſt of the Integrals of Religion, as may appear by the harmony of Confeſſions; whereas they have neither true Faith nor Unity; for hardly do they diſagree from us in any thing, wherein they are not ſubdivided among themſelves. Secondly, we have both a *Law and a Judge*, a Law better nor the Canon Law, the Divine Law of holy Scriptures, a Judge both Celeſtial, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and Terreſtrial, the Synods of the Church: But Romaniſts to ſhoulder up their pretended infallible Judge, whom yet they cannot agree upon, throw intollerable indignities upon the Law of God, as hath been demonſtrated *cap.* 3. Thirdly, *we have an Altar and Sacrifices*, an Altar not like their Altars of *Damaſcus*, but an Altar which ſanctifies our Oblations, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. And thus *Aquinas* himſelf expounds that of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 13. 10. *we have an Altar.* We have alſo a Sacrifice, not only Euchariſtick of prayers and praiſes, but alſo certainly Propitiatory, *viz.* of Chriſt on the Croſs. Fourthly, our Sacraments are not bare ſigns, as Romaniſts ſlander us, but exhibitive of Grace, which cannot be truly ſaid of all theirs. Fifthly, Though the Worſhip of God with us be not clogged, as in the Romiſh Church, with a heap of Ceremonies, partly Heatheniſh, partly Judaical, *yet we have Religious Ceremonies*, *viz.* Sacramental Rites, and theſe alſo of Divine Inſtitution. Sixthly, the Miſſion of our Preachers hath been ſuſtained againſt the cavils of Romaniſts, but a Divine Warrant cannot be ſhewed for their Popes Univerſal Vicarſhip, or the Princely Dignity of their Cardinals. Seventhly, *Our Doctrine is infallible*, and the ground of our Faith ſure, unleſs Romaniſts, like Infidels, will queſtion the Infallibility of the Scripture.

Scripture. Eighthly, Though we pretend not to a Phariſaical perfection with Romaniſts, *yet we acknowledge the Commandments of God, ſo far as is abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation, through Grace, may be kept.* Ninthly, Eternal Life being a reward of Grace, not of Debt, *does not preſuppoſe any proper Merit of ours*; but Romaniſts, by their Doctrine of Merit, make Heaven Venial, and derogate from the ſufficiency of the ſole Merits of Chriſt. Tenthly, Reprobation being an eternal and immanent Act of God, and conſequently God himſelf cannot properly be demerited, but there is no damnation without the previous demerit of ſin, yea, alſo the Eternal Decree of Reprobation, in the judgment of the Council of *Dort*, preſuppoſes the Preſcience of Mans Fall. Eleventhly, *though lapſed man, without Regenerating Grace, cannot do that which is ſpiritually good, yet he may freely ſin*, none of us do queſtion; but the Jeſuits *Garnet, Oldcorn*, &c. acted freely in their acceſſion to the Powder-Plot. Twelfthly, *we pretend not to any new Apoſtles, nor is there neceſſity of new Miracles*, our Doctrine having been fully confirmed by the Miracles of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles. Thirteenthly, It's more than Romaniſts can prove, *that particular Churches have not Authority to reform themſelves, when General Councils cannot be had to undertake the work.* Fourteenthly, we leave *private Spirits, and new Lights*, againſt old revealed Verities, to Quakers and Papiſts. Fifteenthly, *Single mens Opinions againſt the common conſent of Fathers, have more affinity with Jeſuits Probables than Proteſtants.* To juſtifie their boldneſs in broaching new Opinions, *Poza* the Jeſuit, as cited in the Jeſuits Morals, *Part.* 1. *Cap.* 1. *Art.*1. *pag.* 167. brings a Teſtimony from a Council of *Conſtantinople*, *Beatus qui profert verbum inauditum*; as if the Council had ſaid, bleſſed is he that produces a word unheard of, or ſome new thing; whereas like a Jeſuit, he mutilates and perverts the words of the Council, which are, *Beatus qui profert verbum in auditum obedientium*, bleſſed is he who utters a word to obedient ears. Sixteenthly, *We are not aſhamed to maintain, that the Apocryphal Books are no part of the Old Teſtament*, becauſe the Jewiſh Church did never receive them; being told, *Rom.* 3. 2. *that to them were committed the Oracles of God.* Seventeenthly, there have been *ſtedfaſt Paſtors and Martyrs in the Proteſtant Churches, who have ſealed the Truth we profeſs with their blood.* Our Doctrine, and the Subſtantials of Government, being founded on Scriptural Authority,

rity, muſt conſequently be unalterable: whereas *Rome*'s changes, as to dogmaticals, Worſhip and Government from Ancient *Rome*, are ſo many, that we may take up that regrate of her,

Hei mihi, qualis erat, quantum mutaris ab illâ
Româ?

The Author deſigned a peculiar *Cap.* in the cloſe of this Treatiſe, for his own vindication from the *Criminations of the Pampleter*, together with a plain Reparty to the Jeſuit Tribe. But finding that theſe Papers had ſwelled beyond his expectation, he hath at this time ſuperſeded much of that labour; and the rather, ſeeing theſe things touch not the Cauſe, and Jeſuits are known to be perſons of ſuch malignity, that their Invectives find little credit with thoſe that are ingenuous; yea, there be who reckon it an honour to be maligned by them. *Argumentum recti eſt diſplicere peſſimis.* Let therefore theſe few hints of the chief of his Accuſations, at this time, ſuffice.

And firſt, Who would not ſmile that I ſhould be accuſed by this Pamphleter *as a man of uncertain Religion?* eſpecially ſeeing himſelf acknowledges, *pag.* 24. that the Theſis maintained by me is, that the Religion of Proteſtants is the true Chriſtian Religion. If therefore the Religion of Proteſtants be known, mine cannot be uncertain: In that Faith was I Educated from my Infancy, and hitherto, thorough mercy, have continued, and therein I truſt to die. But who can be ſure of a Jeſuits Religion? whoſe Principle it is to equivocate, and by the help of his Mental Reſervations to affirm and ſwear one thing, and to think another? What Sceptick and Infidel Gloſſes, which would make Chriſtian ears to tingle, Jeſuits have put upon the Apoſtolick Creed? *Alphonſus de Vargas* relates *de Stratagem. Jeſuit cap.* 18, 19. yea, ſo cuſtomary is it with them to change themſelves into all ſhapes; and as was roundly told them by a Gentleman of the Long Robe in the Parliament of *Paris*, to have one Conſcience in one place, and another in another, that the world paſſes this Character on them, *Jeſuita omnis homo.*

Muſt not ſecondly, Jeſuits be men of rare confidence, who can accuſe me *of Diſloyalty, for Preaching a Sermon on ſuch a Text of Scripture*, upwards of twenty years ago, when I was a very young man, wherein I do ſincerely profeſs I had not a diſloyal thought. Are not the ſeditious Lectures of Jeſuit *Hay*, and Jeſuit *Cammolet* known, who openly taught execrable Regicide, both in School and Pulpit? Were not the Treaſonable

writings of *Mariana*, *Suarez*, *Santarell*, and of other Jeſuits, aſſerting the lawfulneſs of depoſing and murthering of Kings, ſet forth *permiſſu Superiorum*? Hath the world forgot the barbarous Paracides acted upon *Henry* the Third, and *Henry* the Fourth, two French Kings? or the Powder-Plot deſigned againſt King *James*, and the two Houſes of the Engliſh Parliament, and of the deep acceſſion of Jeſuits to all theſe? What Sticklers Jeſuits were in the late Commotions of *Britain*, D. *Moulin* in his Anſwer to *Philanax*, from *pag.* 58. to 64. hath given an account. How doth an Accuſation of Diſloyalty ſavour out of theſe mens mouths? May not here the words of the Satyriſt have place?

Quis tulerit Gracchos de ſeditione querentes?
Quis Cælum terræ non miſceat, & mare Cælo?
Si fur diſpliceat Verri, homicida Miloni,
Clodius accuſet mœchos, Catilina Cethegum.

As for me, the Heart-ſearching God knows, I abominate whatever hath a tincture of Diſloyalty; and therefore to cut off ſuch Cavils, as I have aſſerted in this Tractate the Ancient Chriſtian Faith againſt Romiſh Novelty, ſo do I avouch before the world Primitive Chriſtian Loyalty. I do cordially ſubſcribe to that of *Optat. lib.* 3. *contra Parmen. Super Imperatorem non eſt niſi ſolus Deus, qui fecit Imperatorem*; and to that of *Tertull. Apol. cap.* 30. *Imperatores in ſolius Dei ſunt poteſtate, à quo ſunt ſecundi, poſt quem primi, ante omnes, & ſuper omnes, & Deos & homines.* Whatever is or hath been repugnant to this, I do for ever diſown. If notwithſtanding all this, Jeſuits will renew the ſame Accuſations, they will do but like themſelves, reacting againſt me *Cockleus*, *Bolſecus*, their game againſt *Luther*, *Calvin*, and *Beza*, charging them again and again with Calumnies. the falſhood whereof hath times without number been evicted; but this, I hope, will ſatisfie perſons of diſcretion and ingenuity.

When thirdly, the Pamphleter did accuſe me of *Diſciplinary Vacillations*, he would perhaps have been more ſober, had he reflected on the atrocious Vacillation of Pope *Liberius*, who profeſſed the Orthodox Faith the one day, and ſubſcribed the Arrian Confeſſion, and the damnation of *Athanaſius* the other; or of Pope *Marcellinus*, who profeſſed Chriſtianity to day, and ſacrificed to Idols to morrow; or of *Claudius Aquaviva*, General of the Jeſuits, who firſt did approve *Mariana*'s Treaſonable

able Book, and then, for fear of the French King, condemned it. Nor know I what Apology can be made for any of theſe, unleſs it be ſaid, *Mutarunt linguam, non mentem*, that they changed their Tongue, but not their Mind; which leaves no leſs ſtain upon their ingenuity, than the change of their mind would have done upon their Intellectuals. Here I muſt advertiſe the Pamphleter, that he and his Fellows diſcover either ignorance or malice, when they upbraid Proteſtants with their Diſciplinary differences, as if they made different Religions. If theſe of the Epiſcopal perſwaſion reſolved their Faith on the Biſhops Authority, as Jeſuits do on the Popes; or if Presbyterians reſolved their Faith on the Authority of the Claſſis, as the *French* and *Venetian* Papiſts do on the General Council; they would indeed make different Religions, as Papiſts certainly have different Religions, notwithſtanding their vain pretences of Infallibility and Unity: But the Faith of all Proteſtants, under theſe various denominations, is reſolved upon the Authority of God ſpeaking in the Scriptures; and beſides, they do agree in Dogmaticals, and ſo cannot make different Religions. I heartily wiſh there were more Pacificatories written, and more pains taken for accommodating our Diſciplinary Controverſies; that all ſound Proteſtants might unanimouſly concur againſt Jeſuits, and the common Adverſaries of the truly Catholick Faith. I deteſt Schiſms, however I be reproached by Jeſuits, remembring that of *Cyprian de Unit. Eccleſ. Qui pacem Chriſti & concordiam rumpit, adverſus Chriſtum facit: quiſquis à matrice diſceſſerit, ſeorſum vivere, & ſpirare non poteſt, & ſubſtantiam Salutis amittit.* And I would humbly obteſt all diſſident Brethren about theſe Diſciplinary Queſtions, (if I could with tears of blood) to conſider if the Lord be not ſignally calling us all to ſtudy *the unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace.* Ah! ſhall we by theſe our Rents open a door to the common Adverſary, who would ſwallow us all up? Were the Unity of the Catholick Church ſtudied, as it ought, it would not only allay the heat of our Diſciplinary Debates, but alſo pull down the ſupercilious Creſt of the Schiſmatical Court of *Rome.*

I am fourthly charged as being of an *unpeaceable nature*: The knack of this Jeſt would be loſt, if my Accuſers were not the known *Bonteſen*'s and Incendiaries of the world. Since I was 16 years of Age, to this day, I have lived in a Collegiate life, as a Regent

Regent of Philoſophy, Miniſter and Profeſſor of Divinity, and in theſe capacities have had many Collegues, with whom I have lived very comfortably. This, together with the peaceable Society which my Reverend Collegues at preſent, and I have together, may ſufficiently confute the Pamphleters accuſation. I confeſs there was once a piece of Debate betwixt a Reverend Perſon, now *in cœlis*, and me, concerning a Diſciplinary Queſtion, wherein perhaps both of us did bewray ſomewhat of humane infirmity; but if therefore either of us ſhould be concluded contentious, hardly could *Hieron*, *Auſtin*, *Ruffin*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Epiphanius*, yea, *Paul* and *Barnabas*, eſcape the like character. I ever had an high reſpect for that Reverend and Worthy Perſon, and do honour his memory; as for other eminent Gifts and Graces, ſo in ſpecial for his faithfulneſs, and zeal againſt Romiſh Idolatry, and I hope, e're long, to live in Eternal Concord and Bliſs with him. I judge it indeed duty to contend *cum vitiis*, againſt errour and ungodlineſs, againſt Popery, Quakeriſm, Prophaneſs, and Atheiſm: Yet I have ſuch affection to perſons ſmitten with theſe diſeaſes, that even for this Railing Jeſuit I can pray, that his ſpite againſt the Truth, and againſt me for the Truths ſake, may not be laid to his charge.

I would treſpaſs too much on the Readers patience, ſhould I inſiſt to reſume the reſt of his ludibrious Raillery. Perhaps to compenſe the ſoftneſs of his Arguments, he hath deſigned to ſtone me with reproaches; but he would remember that *Gratian Caus.* 5. *q.* 1. from the Council of *Eliberis Can.* 52. thunders out an Anathema upon Paſquillers: And a greater than theſe, the Royal Prophet, *Pſal.* 31. 18. *Let lying lips be put to ſilence, which ſpeak grievous things proudly and preſumptuouſly againſt the righteous.*

To conclude, the Reader may know, that the reaſon why this Reply was ſo ſlow in coming abroad, was not that it was not ſooner ready, as could be atteſted by divers credible perſons, who did peruſe it ſhortly after the publiſhing of the Popiſh Pamphlet; but becauſe the Author was little concerned whether it ſhould be committed to the Preſs at all, in regard his Adverſaries Book contained nothing which had not been confuted with an Antidate, ſave only the Perſonal Invectives, the chief ſignificancy whereof was to demonſtrate the ſpleeniſh humour of Jeſuits. But ſince Providence is bringing theſe Papers to publick view, the God of Truth make them ſubſervient for the good of his Church. *Amen.*

FINIS.

A

TABLE

Of the chief heads contained in this Treatiſe.

The Preface pag. 1

Cap. 1. A brief ſurvey of the Pamphleters empty and unfaithful Apologies for Jeſuit Dempſter. pag. 6

Cap. 2. There is no neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge of controverſies in the Church, and conſequently, the baſis of the Pamphleters whole diſcourſe is overthrown. pag. 22

Sect. 1. The true ſtate of the queſtion propounded. pag. 23

Sect. 2. Arguments proving there is no neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge in the Church. pag. 26

Sect. 3. The Pamphleters objections for the neceſſity of an infallible viſible Judge diſcuſſed. pag. 53

Chap. 3. That the Scriptures are the compleat, infallible, and principal rule of Faith. pag 71

Sect. 1 Some hints of indignities put upon the holy Scriptures by Romaniſts. pag 71

Sect 2. the ſtate of the queſtion concerning the rule of Faith, opened; and the Scriptures briefly proved to be the rule of Faith, pag. 75

Sect. 3. The Pamphleters four principal objections, againſt the Scriptures being the com

pleat rule of Faith, discussed. pag. 89
Sect. 4. *Some reflections on the rest of the Pamphleters rapsodik discourse concerning the rule of Faith.* pag. 117
Cap. 4. *A discourse of fundamentals, with some reflections, on the contradictions, impertinences and falsehoods of the Romish Pamphleter in his Sect.* 5. pag. 141
Sect. 1. *Whether there be ground for the distinction of Fundamentals and non-Fundamentals, or of essentials and integrals in religion.* pag. 143
Sect. 2. *Whether do the Scriptures contain clearly all the Fundamentals of Faith.* pag. 151
Sect. 3. *Whether all be Fundamentals which the Church imposes as Fundamentals.* pag. 168
Sect. 4. *Whether was it necessary for the dicision of the question betwixt Mr.* Dempster *and the author, to determine the precise number of Fundamentals.* pag. 174
Sect. 5. *Whether is the Popish religion injurious to the fundamentals of Christianity.* pag. 178
Sect. 6. *Whether the Waldenses, Wickleviſts and Huſſites be of the same religion as to fundamentals and essentials with Protestants.* pag. 180
Sect. 7. *Whether do the Greek Churches agree with Protestants as to fundamentals.* pag. 186
Sect. 8. *Whether the doctrine of Protestants, in all points of Controverſie, be openly against God, and his written word (as the Pamphleter affirms) and so contrary to the fundamentals of religion* pag. 189
Cap. 5. *Concerning Transubstantiation and the number of Sacraments.* pag. 433
Sect. 1. *The Popish figment of Transubstantiation briefly*

briefly confuted, and the Authors argument againſt it, vindicated, from the exceptions of the Pampleter. pag. 433

Sect. 3. *The Pampleters ſuperficial reflections on the number and nature of Sacraments examined.* pag. 440

Cap. 6. *VVhether Proteſtant Churches do grant, that the viſible Church, was not alwayes preſerved, and that for* 1400 *years before* Luther, *Popery was the only prevailing religion.* p. 452

Cap. 7. *The truth of the* Proteſtant *Religion evicted, by the comformity thereof with the faith of the primitive* Church, *in the firſt three ages, and the falſhood of the Preſent Romiſh Religion, from the diſagreement thereof, with the faith of theſe ages.* pag. 467

Sect. 1. *the Pamphleters firſt inſtance of novelty touching the Popes ſupremacy briefly canvaſed and retorted upon Romaniſts.* pag. 469

Sect. 2. *The ſecond inſtance of novelty, concerning unwritten traditions examined, retorted upon Romaniſts.* pag. 476

Sect. 3. *The third inſtance of novelty concerning the ſacrifice of the maſs, conſidered and retorted upon Romaniſts.* pag. 479

Sect 4. *A fourth inſtance of novelty concerning Tranſubſtantiation diſcuſſed, and retorted upon Romaniſts.* pag. 267

Sect. 5. *A fifth inſtance of novelty concerning purgatory, examined and retorted upon Romaniſts.* pag. 270

Sect. 6. *A ſixt inſtance of novelty, concerning invocation of Saints examined and retorted upon Romaniſts.* pag. 276

Sect. 7. *A ſeventh inſtance of novelty concerning*

Croſſes and images examined and retorted upon Romaniſts. pag. 281

Sect. 8. *An eight inſtance of novelty concerning free-will examined and repelled.* pag. 286

Sect. 9. *A ninth inſtance of novelty concerning merits examined and retorted.* pag. 290

Sect. 10. *A tenth inſtance of novelty, concerning a perfect keeping of the commands examined and retorted.* pag. 292

Appendix 1. *Containing another Decad of Romiſh novelties in Religion.* pag. 294

Appendix, 2. *The* Pamphleters *impertinent citations from* Juſtin Martyr, *together with a new Catalogue of hereſies falſly charged on Proteſtants briefly diſcuſſed.* pag. 314

Cap. 8. *A confutation of the* Pamphleters *laſt ſection, wherein, beſide other things, his three notes of the* Catholick Church, viz. *Miracles, Converſion of Infidels, and Sanctity of life are examined, and by them alſo the truth of the reformed, and falſhood of the* Popiſh *religion demonſtrated.* pag. 321

Sect. 1. *A bundel of the* Pamphleters *moſt impudent ſlanders againſt* Proteſtants *rejected.* pag. 321.

Sect. 2. *The* Pamphleters *equivocation in propounding the grounds of the Romiſh Religion.* pag. 322.

Sect. 3. *Three propoſitions of the* Pamphleter, *on which all the intereſt of the* Papacy *doth hang, Canvaſed.* pag. 323

Subject. 1. *The* Pamphleters *ſophiſms for his firſt propoſition* viz. *that there is an infallible propounder, briefly diſcuſſed* pag. 323

Subject. 2. *The* Pamphleters *ſecond propoſition,* viz. *that, the true* Church *is the infallible propounder conſidered* pag. 327

Subject.

Subject. 3. *The pamphleters third proposition,* viz. *that the Roman* Church *is the only true* Catholick Church, *considered.* pag. 332
Article. 1. *Of* Miracles. pag. 332
Article 2. *Of the Conversion of Infidels.* pag. 349
Article 3. *Of sanctity of life.* pag. 355
Sect. 4. *A touch of the Pamphleters hints at other notes of the* Church, viz. *the title of* Catholick *and Succession.* pag. 374
Sect. 5. *A brief reparty to his concluſory knacks.* pag. 382
A poſtſcript, vindicating the Author from the Criminations of the Pamphleter. pag. 385

AN

An Advertiſment concerning the Errata.

THe Author living in another Kingdom, and not being able to reviſe the Preſs, and the Copy which came hither having been written by a young Scholar not ſo correctly as might have been wiſhed, many errors have crept into the work; ſome of which do greatly wreſt the ſenſe, yea ſometimes do deſtroy it. May it therefore pleaſe the ſerious Reader, when any thing occurrs which ſeems incongruous, to turn over to the Errata, where readily he may find that cleared, which in the work appeared intricate, or perhaps abſurd. As for inſtance p. 318. l. 2. *It may juſtly ſeem ſtrange, that the epithet Saint is prefixed to* Ambroſe Catharinus *a moderne Romaniſt, as if he had been the ancient, S.* Ambroſe. B. *of Millan; whereas by looking on the Errata, where.* S. *is appointed to be expunged, the Reader may underſtand that the Epithet Saint was not in the Authors Copy. By the ſame meanes diverſe other miſtaks of the impreſſion may be cleared, eſpecially ſeeing it is hoped, that theſe which are not ſet down may eaſily be obſerved by the judicious Reader. It is likewiſe granted, that many treſpaſſes are committed in the punctation, but there was neceſſity to leave theſe to the Correction of the intelligent Reader. Where the Printer found in the Coppy this figure.* S *he ordinarily hath printed Sect. and ſo hath ſometimes put twice Sect. in one place. Some of thoſe eſcapes are noted amongſt the Errata, that by them the Reader might eaſily paſs judgment on the reſt. And if he would be at pains to correct the errours with his pen, he would oblige the Author, and eaſe thoſe of trouble, who afterwards ſhould make uſe of his book. If either Jeſuit, or other Reader impute any of theſe, or ſuch like eſcapes unto the Author, he will diſcover more prejudice againſt the cauſe, or perſon of the Author, than either judgment or diſcretion. However the Errata is ſubjoyned for the uſe of ingenuous lovers of truth.*

It is to be noted, that whereas cap. 3. Sect. 3. page 94. Lyranus, Paulus Burgenſis, Valla & Cajetan *are joyned with* Eraſmus, Pagnin, Arias Montanus &c. *the meaning is not, that the firſt four Authors had tranſlated entire books of Scripture, as the latter had done, but that thoſe alſo in their* Expoſitions *of Scripture, did frequently recede from the Vulgar Latin, and corrected it.*

Likewiſe, where as it is ſaid cap. 3. Sect. 3. pag 95. that Romaniſts can only object againſt our tranſlations of Scripture ſome

rath

raſh expreſſions of private men, who can pretend to no authority. *that is to be underſtood of* Caſtalio, Broughton, Carolus Molinæus, and others *of that quality cited by the Pamphleter. But there a touch ſhould have been given how the Pamphleter had abuſed an expreſſion of King James in the conference at* Hampton Court, *viz. that the* Geneva *tranſlation is the worſt of all Engliſh tranſlations. This expreſſion of the King the Pamphleter abuſes to impugne the Scriptures, being the rule of Faith, which his Majeſty never intended, nor was his meaning that the* Geneva *tranſlation compoſed*, Anno. 1560. *By the Engliſh Exiles, who fled thither in the Reign of Queen* Mary, *or that the other Engliſh tranſlations, the faillours whereof were likewiſe briefly hinted at by the King, did not contain all things neceſſary to Salvation. Yea the particular treſpaſes noted by his Majeſty in the* Geneva *bible were in the Marginal annotations, not in the tranſlation it ſelf. The real deſign of the King was to hold forth, that no Engliſh tranſlation then extant had arrived at the perfection, which were not only to be wiſhed, but alſo by more induſtry might be attained, whereupon his Majeſty gave ſpecial order to compoſe the Engliſh tranſlation, which we now by the mercy of God do enjoy. It were good that Romaniſts had as much ingenuity to acknowledge the errors of their vulgar Latin, as laſtly corrected by* Clement *the eight, a ſpecimen whereof hath been exhibited by* Franciſus Lucas Brugenſis.

If any be not ſatisfied with the touch given of the Keri *and* Chetib, pag. 102. 103. *they are remitted to* Sixtinus Amama *his diſſertation* de Keri & Chetib in coronide ad Grammaticam Martinio Buxtorfianam. *where though that learned Author ſeem to make large conceſſions concerning the* Keri *and* Chetib, *and the various lections, yet neither do they overthrow the doctrine of the reformed Church concerning Scriptures being the rule of faith, as* Amama *himſelf in the Anſwer of ſome objections endeavours to clear.*

It is alſo to be noted that whereas in page 472. Clements Epiſt. 1. *is pronounced ſpurious. The Authors deſigne was not to cenſure* Clements firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians *lately publiſhed by Mr.* Patrick Young, *which* Rivet Crit. ſac. lib. 1. cap. 8. *Commends as ſavouring of primitive ſimplicity, and* Hottinger in Elenchо librorum ſuppoſititiorum *ſaith*, de ea Noſtri nihil durius pronunciarunt, *for that is not the Epiſtle cited by the Pamphleter, but another paſſing under the name of* Clements *firſt Epiſtle to S.* James, *which is juſtly concluded ſpurious. And albeit the Epiſtle were genuine, yet the teſtimony adduced*

ced from it, is impertinent, ſeeing it ſpeaks not of the Popes ſupremacy but partly of that which was common to S. Peter *with the reſt of the Apoſtles, namely, that he was called* Fundamentum Eccleſiæ, *which is alſo attributed to the reſt,* Eph. 2. 20. Rev. 21. 14. *and partly of his perſonal prerogatives and indowments, in regard whereof he is ſaid to be* potentior omnium *which might well conſiſt with equality of juriſdiction.*

DEdic. p.2. l.3. l.11. r.*adoriam*. p.11. l.35. r.*lib.*13. p.12. l.39. r.*Rom.*3. 3.8. p.14. l.19. r.*twelve years*. p.23. l.21. r.*diffuſive*. p.24. l.14. r.*diffuſive*. l.28. r.*Domatis might have*. p.31. l.31. r.*thoſe Fathers do only compare*. p.52. l.20. r.*againſt P. Jewell*. p.53. l.22. r.18 *Mat.* 28.20. p.57. l.7. r.*Euſeb.* 32. p.62. l.10. r.*Evangelium*. p.65. l.30. r.*lib.*2. *de Concilius*. p.67. l.35. r.*contra Epiſt. Fundamenti*. p.72. l.34. In place of *Iſidor Clariut* r.*Lucas Brugenſis*. l.38 r.*diffuſe*. 4 *Sect.* 2. p.73. l.21. r. *diſperſa ſenſes*. l.32. r.*Qui roga*. p.75. l.30. r.*preaching*. p.76. l.33. *art.*10. r.*ad primum*. p.77. l.3. r.*Sect.*2. *N.*5. l.24. r.*Qui reg*. p.85. l.33. r.*wiſeſt*. p.88. l.24. r.*ſuy*. l.28. r.*usurpatio*. p.91. l.34. r.321. p.93. l.9. r.*Tom.*3. p.135. p.95. 22. l. r.*ſummum*. l.33. r *errour deſtroying an Article of Faith*. p.96. l.12, 23. r.*juſtifie known ſaults*. p.100. l.7. r.*Calvinus*. l.22. r.*falſities*. p.103. l.4. r. *to confute him*. p.104. l.1. r.*Buxtorf's*. p.106. l.28. r. *Modern*. l.31. r.*retorts*. p.112. l.19. r.*atque adeo*. l.20. r. *iſt is*. p.114. l.30. r.*concilio*. p.115. l.32. r.*Sect.*12 N 39. p.120. l.19. r.*v wicked*. p.122. l.10. r.*thereunto*. p.125. l.7. r.*Lutz* 7.34.35. l.19. r.*faith only*. p.128. l.19. r.*Conſubſtantiality*. p.132. l.8. r.*at ſelly*. p.135. l.6. r.*Pineda*. p.139 l.31. r *Ithomitæ pinis*. p.142 l.20, 21. r.*ſeeming divergencies*. l.22. r.*ſummam*. p.145 l.18. r.*Pompeium*. p.150 l.23. r.*ſenſe of hearing*. p.154. l.5. r.*thom.*9 l.16. r.*Eccleſiam*. p.155. l.2. r.*in ea ech. queſt.*9. p.157. l.35 36. r.*Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib.*4. *cap.*7. *and the Hiſtorians by Euſebius likewiſe Hiſt Eccleſ lib.*6. *cap.*37. p.160. l.4. r.*Act.*19.12. p.161. l.1. r.*Sect.*6 *Num.*2 8. l.7. In place of *Sect.*13. r *Hæreſ.*13. l.32. r.*ſo far from*. l.39. r.*appeal. lib.*5. *cap.*7. *Sect.*2. l.36. r *unius ejuſdemque*. p.172 l.7. r. in place of *Sect.*22. r. *Paragraph* 22 p.175 l.19 r.*pars* 1. *cap* 3. l.23. r. *fundamentality*. p.178. l.22. r. *ſi ſecundo probatur*. l.32. r *2dly. Tenaci*. l.28. r.*pro. titionary*. p.181. l.33. r. *the interceſſion and ſuffrages*. p.182. l.13. r.*page* 230. l.24. r. *page* 183. l.31. r. *ſuffiſiency*. l.8. r. *and mighty*. l.26. r. *whom*. l.12. dele *is*. p.188. l.15. r. *may ſit*. p.189 l.20. r. *againſt Scriptures and by Scripture at his pleaſure*. l. 22. r. *indicio*. p.192. l. r. *ignoſcitur*. p. 195. l 10. r. *impart*. p. 196. l. 13. r. *John* 20.23. p.197. l.37. r. *of the word*. p.201. l 11. r. *ſeverity*. p.204. l.11. dele *to*. p.434. l. r. *Tertul. lib.*4. *adverſus Marcion*. p.435 l 3 r. *ſubſtantiver*. l.4. r. *he ſaid*. p.436. l 17 r. *ſo ſavit* twice. p.437. 8 r *properly predicated*. l.15 r. *I aſſerted*. p.438. l.11 r. *at the firſt*. p.441. l.24. r. *down to Legion*. l.26. r. *an errour*, l.39. r. *is falſe*. p.442. l.5 r. *two dioces*. l 14. r. *he brings in*. l.3 31. r. *lib.*5. p. 446. l.5 r. *Suarez*. l 4. *de Sacram*. p.455. l.6. r. *in the matter of rebaptization*. p.457. l.35. r. *contraria*. p.459. l.19. r. *inde a que*. p.460. l 2. r. *innumeris*, p.463. l.8. r. *one father*. p.468. l.2. r. *Pap.*4. l.31 r. *invocation*. p.471. l.21. r. *aſſert*. p.476. l 15. r. *Irenæus lib* 3. *cap.*1. p.477. l.15. r *transmitted down*. l. 27. r. *Art* 7 l 31. r. *Art.*10. l.32. r. *Art* 17. p.480. l 8. r. *our Divines*. l.33. r. *commemorative* p. 265. l.3. r *baptiſm*. l.5. r *contra Fauſt*. l.17. r *Tertullian*. l.19. r. *the Church ſaith Tertullian*. l.23. r. *pag.* 101. p.267. l.31. r. *cap.* 7 p 269. l.28. r. *averſus*. p.272. l.4. r. *gratia eſt*. p.273 l 20. r. *ſect 6 purgatory*. l.29. r. *Tertul. lib. de patientia. cap.*9. p.274 l 31. r. *quæſtionibus*. p.275. l.18 r. *day of Judgement*. p.278 l.29 r. *cauſſir*. p.280 l.10. r. *pag.*43. p.281. l.1 r. *noſtra piam ſcitera*. p.283 l.6 r. *alſo*. p.284 l.6. r. *ſtrictare*. l 18 r. *Helena*, l.23. *was only*. l.40. r. *lib.*7. *cap.*17. *But it is as true*. p.285. l.2. r. *not with us*. l 18. r. *ſo far from aſſerting*. l.19. *ſeeing as aforeſaid*. l 23 r. *of the Councils* p.288. l.29. r. *hear himſelf*. p.289. l 16. *Sect.*1. r. p.290. l 2. r. *his* their. l.28. after *opera* add *newly upon the account of the work*. p.291. l 19. r. *another*. p.292. l.9. r. *de Fuſt adval & hab*. l.34. r. *they that*. p. 294 l.15. r *acquitted*. l 29. r. *Chrom a*. l.37 r. *Pag.*8. p.296. l 1. r *cap.*3 *pag.*114. p 297. l.10. r. *to be the authority*. p.298. l.28 r. *Jus. Ord*. p.299. l.24. r. *of the Roman*. p.312. l.25. r. *de jure*. l.23. r. *Art.* 11. l.29. r. *ſo exceedingly*. p.317. l.23. dele *cap.*5. l.26. after *upon their claſſics*. r. *as is reported of Socrates, lib.*3 *cap.*17. *and by Suidas lib.*5. *cap.*21. p.318. l.2. dele *S.* p.319. l.7. r. *Sheriff*. l.24. r. *as of S. Cyprian*. p.320. l.22. r. *to allow*. p.325. l.4. *Talaſius*. l.15. r. *at leaſt*. l.36. r. *more pretty*. p. 335. l.26. r. *to be the*. l.34. r. *Dollæus*. l.4. r. *de obitu*. p.336. l.4. r. *lib.*11. *cap.*5. p.340. l.5. r. *as reſp.* r.312. l.16. *Virgill*. l.40. r. *Colo*. p.341. l.11. r. *cap.*6. p.534. p.359. l.30. r. *quodlibet* 2. p.364 l.27. r. *and not like to whom*. p.365. l.16. r. *humane ſociety*. p.371. l.11. r. *Romæ*. p. 375. l. 22. r. *Alexandrus*. p.384. l.6. r. *venal*.

FINIS.